

Communist regime in what was both an end to legal free opposition to them and a classic case of their callous disregard for world opinion. When Nikola Petkov was murdered for his political beliefs a martyr was created against the tyranny which has been ruthlessly forced upon the Bulgarian people. His death was neither the first nor the last of men and women who sought to bring liberty and democracy to Bulgaria. But the nature of his trial and his gallant performance during it are an example of the hard and dangerous task which must be faced in fighting oppression.

Nikola Petkov was accused of no crimes except opposing the creation of a Communist satellite in his native land. He undoubtedly was put under great pressure to confess his sins as did so many others in Eastern Europe during those terrible days when Communist rule was being established. But he never yielded. He never confessed to the trumped-up charges by which he was being railroaded to his legal death. The manner of conducting his trial is worthy of our remembering. People testified to lies against him. His witnesses were intimidated. His lawyers were arrested as soon as he chose them. He was only brought to trial because the Communist-dominated assembly voted to deprive him of his parliamentary immunity. Convicted by a kangaroo court he was hanged on September 23, 1947, in what was a horrible warning to all opposition to Communist tyranny in Eastern Europe.

The Bulgarian people, Mr. Speaker, will not forget the example set by Nikola Petkov. Nor should those of us who are more fortunate in living in free lands. Like so many others he had the courage to fight for a better way of life for his nation. He must have known that all the high cards were held by his ruthless opponents. The examples of countless other political murders of his countrymen were fresh. But, while knowing the fate in store for him, he led the last free opposition to the complete Red takeover. On this day of national memorial for the Bulgarian nation, it is fitting that we should remember that the hope for a free democratic Bulgaria was made brighter because a man was willing to die for his people's cause. I wish to ex-

tend my best wishes to the Bulgarian people on this day dedicated to one of their national heroes.

Latins Want Change—Not Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it unfortunate that House Resolution 560 was presented on the floor yesterday. The House resolution according to its terms states that:

Any subversive threat (of communism) violates the Monroe Doctrine and any contracting party (country) to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may resort to armed force to forestall and combat control and colonization (by communism).

A few words have been omitted from the quoted purpose, but the sense is apparently clear.

Certainly the United States should have learned some things from recent diplomatic history. We have won many friends in Latin America in modern times, probably really beginning with the F.D.R. "good neighbor" policy and the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties. This friendship has flourished from time to time and reached its culmination in the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress programs. Many in the Latin world are true friends of America. Of others, their friendship has been dulled by lack of substantial Latin American progress in spite of the largest hemispheric aid program in history.

Many in Latin America want change. They resort to communism in Chile where 24 percent are registered in that party, not because of Russian submarines off the coast or parachuting Red Chinese infiltrators, but because 600,000 people can't live like animals in Santiago seeing much of the aid money go into military weapons and being filtered off at the top by the 100 ruling families.

The Alliance for Progress in Latin America should be aimed at short circuiting the military juntas and selfish power blocks wherever possible in an all out effort to effectuate "change" at the grass-roots by helping plain people to better their standard of living. During the last year we have helped Socialist President Frei of Chile take steps to effect "change"—he has the vision and the power to stop communism in its tracks.

Our fine relations with the Chilean people were slightly confounded with our entry into the Dominican Republic—not because Chile is for communism but because she resented the interference in the affairs of a sovereign state where a clear case of outside intervention was not made out in violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This is much like in a criminal case when the court throws out an indictment based on unlawful search and seizure. The court takes the action not because it favors the criminal, but because the Bill of Rights is paramount. Irrespective, I think the Dominican Republic action can be rationalized in defense of the administration, especially with the action by the OAS.

When the Congress then passes House Resolution 560 which would appear to lock in concrete Dominican Republic-type policy for the future—a policy of force for the United States or any of the Americas based on a fragmentary threat—it is readily foreseeable that America will be further embarrassed in her relationship with her "good neighbors."

If we then confound this by establishing quotas on hemispheric immigration to protect ourselves from hemispheric Communists, we will, in fact, lay the cornerstone for chaos in the Americas for the balance of the 20th century.

To tell any Latin dictator that he can forcibly meddle, with our approval, in the affairs of his neighbor that may or may not have a substantial Communist Party on the theory that he is forcibly suppressing a Communist threat, can only have the effect of, in fact, stimulating the forces of communism and diminishing American stature on these continents.

A Birch-type philosophy does not work in the United States. Why should it work outside?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Psalms 95:2: *Let us come into His presence with thanksgiving.*

Almighty God, during the hours of the new day, may we be aware of Thy presence, filling our minds and hearts with Thy peace and power and may Thy love always be with us to guard and guide us in the ways which are well pleasing unto Thee.

May we feel how solemn and wonderful it is to live daily under Thy kind and

beneficent providence which will never leave us uncared for and unprotected and nourished.

Grant that our whole life may be a pursuit of the best not only for ourselves but especially also for the needy members of the human family who may be finding the struggle of life so very difficult.

In these strange times when confused cries are echoing through the world, may we hear and heed Thy voice proclaiming the eternal values and bidding us to be strong and steadfast in the faith.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2414, An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Ore.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9221) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 8, 10, 24, 62.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8715) entitled "An act to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10323) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1357. An act to revise existing bail practices in courts of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies; and

S. 1826. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, I was necessarily absent because of a death in my family and I missed certain rollcall votes. I would like to have the RECORD indicate my position on each of these issues. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

H.R. 8439, motion to table previous motion on H.R. 8439, rollcall No. 262: "Yea."

H.R. 10775, rollcall No. 263: "Yea."

H.R. 168, rollcall No. 264: "Yea."

Senate Joint Resolution 102, rollcall No. 265: "Yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have some family responsibilities from time to time. On Monday last I found it necessary to take a daughter to college in the Speaker's State. As a result thereof, I missed rollcalls 309 and 310.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "yea" in each instance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the RECORD to so indicate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 314]

Anderson, Ill.	Foley	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Passman
George W.	Glaimo	Redlin
Andrews	Hanna	Resnick
Glenn	Harris	Roosevelt
Ashley	Herlong	Scott
Ayres	Hicks	Senner
Bolton	Hollifield	Springer
Bonner	Holland	Stephens
Bow	Hosmer	Stratton
Brock	Johnson, Okla.	Tenzer
Burton, Utah	Lindsay	Thomas
Colmer	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Dickinson	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Watson
Dow	Miller	Willis
Farnsley	Moorhead	
Fino	O'Brien	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2300, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through title II of the committee substitute, ending on line 24, page 77.

Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NELSEN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN: On page 68, after line 22 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project

for any work done by such interests on such project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized."

Renumber succeeding sections and reference thereto accordingly.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will give me his attention. I received a call from the Bureau of the Budget and it was called to my attention that the last several lines of my original amendment were objected to. However, the first part of it—the amendment that was discussed yesterday—was found to be satisfactory and a precedent did exist similar to it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, the committee is fully familiar with the project about which the gentleman speaks, as the gentleman knows, and is most sympathetic.

Do we have it correctly understood that in the gentlemen's amendment he is dropping and deleting the originally proposed latter part which deals with the excess cost, in case of excess, of required local contributions and the Secretary of the Army be authorized to reimburse such local interests for all amounts in excess of such required contributions?

Do I understand the gentleman is deleting that language in his proposed amendment?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes; in keeping with the request of the Bureau of the Budget I have deleted this part. I hope the first part will cover it. I realize that it would be unwise to press for something unacceptable to the committee and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his concurrence in the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment as the gentleman presents it, which omits the point that had been giving us difficulties. The amendment is satisfactory and the committee agrees to it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman indicate what language is being stricken?

Mr. NELSEN. The language which appears in the middle of the paragraph beginning with "if the costs to local interests"—and then from there on strike the rest of the original amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's request conforms then to the type of action our committee has taken in other instances in a similar situation and does not thus give preference to this project over other projects?

Mr. NELSEN. It is my understanding there is a precedent for this and I believe it is fully justified. I am sure there will be no objection in the Congress to later coming through with the necessary appropriations for the project.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to say to the gentleman that he made a most convincing presentation yesterday on the

floor of the House. I consider this a most unique situation relative to this project and for that reason insofar as this side of the aisle is concerned we too accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of a district plagued by a persistent drought, I certainly hope that the Congress on ultimate passage will retain title I which deals with the problem of water supply in the northeastern part of our Nation. I urge my colleagues in this House as well as the other body not to abandon a vitally important section of our country to the vagaries of unpredictable nature.

As paradoxical as it may sound, the provision in the bill may at the same time solve the problem of the water shortage which is haunting us now and the problem of floods which has vexed us in the past.

By allowing the U.S. Army Engineers to plan for the construction, operation, and maintenance of major reservoirs by the United States, we will be taking a giant step forward in the age-old battle against the devastation of the elements.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDWIN

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: Page 58, line 13, strike out "\$133,548,000" and all that follows down through and including the period on line 2 of page 59, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$88,402,000, except that pump storage power development is not authorized to be constructed at such project."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make a modification in the project which is authorized on page 58 of the bill, called the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, W. Va. This would simply eliminate the authorization to build a public power facility as a portion of this project. The project is economically feasible without it. The flood control aspects and the construction of a flood control reservoir are economically feasible without the public power facility. This would simply strike that facility.

I think it is important to note that an application has been pending before the Federal Power Commission by a public utility in the area, the Monongahela Power Co., for a permit to construct a powerplant on this river in this general location. Not only has this application been pending before the Federal Power Commission but since our hearings in the last month the Federal Power Commission has issued an order. I hold a copy of it in my hand. This relates to the Monongahela Power Co. application and awards the company a 24-month preliminary permit to study the proposed

380,000 kilowatt pump storage project on this river in West Virginia.

Since the permit is not only pending for construction, but a preliminary permit has now been granted for the 24-month study, it seems to me it would be inappropriate for us at this time while the study is now authorized and in process to authorize the expenditure of \$45 million of Federal funds for the construction of a public power facility that will not be necessary if this private powerplant is built.

In the Senate an amendment was approved which has the wording that appears in the House bill that states, and I read from the House bill:

Provided, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project:

The committee wording goes on with this further proviso:

Provided further, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be \$88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

The language therefore goes ahead and approves now the Federal construction of a Federal power facility if the FPC does not grant an application for a private power facility. This would authorize a Federal power facility if the FPC does not act. I think we are prejudicing the case before the FPC if we approve a law today that gives definite approval to a public power facility if the FPC does not act favorably on the final construction permit.

It seems to me we should defer any such decision and give the FPC a clear right to make a ruling without having any legislation that says we automatically have authorized a Federal power facility if the FPC does not grant this private permit.

For this reason my motion would just strike out the Federal cost for Federal construction of the power facility and simply authorizes the other aspects of the project, including flood control. Incidentally, it would save \$45 million which I am sure our Federal taxpayers would be very happy to have us say that we could save.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The proposed authorization of this project has been criticized because it would provide authorization for Federal construction of the power features in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications. It is contended that no Federal authorization should be provided if private interests are taking active measures to construct the project.

In this connection, it is to be noted that the language in the present bill places no restriction in the way of pri-

vate development other than the approval of the Federal Power Commission—a step required in the case of any project licensed by the Federal Power Commission. In fact, the act gives priority to the private developer and no consideration could be given to Federal construction of the power facilities unless and until the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending application. The Federal Power Commission has, in fact, granted a temporary permit to the Monongahela Power Co. to study private power development.

The bill would insure full comprehensive development of the Rowlesburg site, including construction of the power facilities by either a private developer under Federal Power Commission license, or if this is not done, by the Federal Government. There is no reason to delay Federal authorization at this time. If, for one reason or another, the power was not developed by a private developer there would be a subsequent delay in obtaining Federal authorization.

If the power facilities are not constructed concurrently with construction of the Federal dam and reservoir it will be necessary for the Government to include an intake and tunnel stub at a cost of \$1½ million to permit the later addition of power either by the private developer or the Government. To avoid excessive costs, this must be done before the reservoir is filled. Such initial costs will be repaid by the private developer, but in all likelihood will be sunk costs and never recovered if the private developer should back out and there is no Federal authorization for power construction. The Government could insure recovery of these initial costs under the terms of the bill. If the private developer is indeed sincere in making the application and is not making it primarily as a device to forestall the development of public power it is difficult to see how he can object to the inclusion of provisions for Federal authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. In this project, if it is constructed, coal will be used, will it not, to produce electricity?

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. And instead of electric energy produced solely by waterpower, we will use up at least 1 kilowatt of energy produced by coal for every kilowatt of energy obtained from the hydroelectric generators? The energy produced by coal will be used to pump the water about a thousand feet uphill to the reservoir for the hydroelectric generator?

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to assure the gentleman in the well that I have been assured by the head of the utility company that proposes to build this project and that has made application to build it, that if the application is approved, 100 percent union coal will be used at the Rowlesburg plant.

Mr. KEE. That is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. I just wanted to make it clear that by building the project, we will be using coal, the one thing that we have in abundance in the State of West Virginia, to produce the electricity and that by doing that we will be developing the whole area economically and we will be bringing in more industry and that we will be using our natural products and resources. Also it will be the first attack on poverty in a direct and positive way that we have ever had in our area.

Further I want to point out that this is the only major project I know of that has ever been proposed to be constructed in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. My colleague is correctly stating the situation.

Mr. STAGGERS. For that reason I want to be sure that this project is approved and the only way we can do it is by assuring that public power stands in the background in case this permit is not issued by the Public Power Commission and also if the utility is dilatory in constructing the facility once license has been granted. We want to be absolutely sure that West Virginia is not deprived of this vital project because of the failure or inability of private industry to act promptly.

Mr. KEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think it should be pointed out to the committee that this project has a benefit cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. Let us examine the report and see if that is concurred in by the Federal agencies and the State. On page 40 of the report, the statement is made as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.
Federal Power Commission: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
State of West Virginia: Favorable.

Therefore, we see that all these State and Federal agencies and the State of West Virginia are in favor of this project that is being discussed here today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Very briefly, I am hopeful that we can get to final consideration of these amendments to the bill this afternoon.

The gentleman from California has very clearly explained why he feels that unless this amendment is adopted that the Federal Power Commission, which presently has issued a preliminary license to the private enterprise development, is likely, on final consideration to be prejudiced by the action of this Congress in authorizing the project as a possible function at taxpayers' expense. I agree with the gentleman from California wholeheartedly.

I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is a most reasonable one. It is most reasonable considering the circumstances of the consideration which will be given, according to the majority's report on S.

2300, next year, on an annual basis, of these omnibus bills. By that time, the Federal Power Commission will have had a reasonable opportunity to act. There will be no delay in the matter, and the matter can be considered next year.

I refer to page 2 of the committee report, where the following statement appears:

The committee intends to report an omnibus bill every year hereafter rather than every 2 to 4 years.

So I suggest that the question will be considered on its merits by the Federal Power Commission, construction will not be prejudiced, and the taxpayers' burden of paying the cost will not be prejudiced.

Under those circumstances, it is logical and reasonable to agree to the amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] sat through and heard all the hearings on this subject. His amendment would give the Commission an opportunity to act on the private development aspects, which it already has done preliminarily.

I understand that there is some argument that perhaps private enterprise will not push it hard enough. It seems to me that private enterprise has pushed it hard enough to get a preliminary license, and, it seems to me, they have shown good faith and intent to go ahead with the project. I cannot understand why our committee insists on prejudicing the private development of that power by inserting in the bill proposed language which indicates that if they do not act on the project, then the Congress will authorize a public project. That is not the way to do it. I do not want the Federal Power Commission so prejudiced. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, my colleague from California, my good friend and colleague from Florida and I are not necessarily in disagreement on this issue. It is highly important to me—and to my State—that this project be undertaken, and I want insurance that it will be undertaken. As the gentlemen know, and as the Congress knows, the proposal here is only an authorization. If the private power company goes ahead—and I know they will go ahead, unless some unforeseen circumstances intervene—there will be no question that the project will be built and operated by the private power company. I can see no harm in authorizing it. The House committee saw no harm in authorizing it after prolonged debate.

I remember that before final conclusion was reached, a preliminary permit to the utility company had been brought to the attention of the House committee.

Many things might happen in the next year or two, when the project should be in process of construction. Then, if the private power company does not build it, and this public construction provision is eliminated from the bill, we would have to come back here and ask again for authorization for public construction, thus delaying action for an unreasonable time.

If this project is authorized, as submitted, there will never be any money

appropriated. There will never be a request for it.

As to the fears of my friend from Florida, that if the bill passes as now written, the Federal Power Commission will never grant permission for private construction, let me assure the gentleman and the Congress that I will unreservedly support any reasonable measure designed to secure FPC permission for private construction. I want to have the assurance that public power is going to stand in the background. The Senate wanted it that way, and our committee voted it out that way.

As I said, this is the first major project which has ever been proposed to be constructed in the State of West Virginia. Certainly, at this time I do not want to jeopardize it. It will mean much to our people. It will be a direct attack on poverty. It will be one which will consume our natural products, bring in industry, and create jobs right in the center of our State.

The dam in itself is a good thing, but will do only half the job. The power-generating project will do the other half.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We on the committee know the great interest the gentleman from West Virginia has taken in this project. If the Baldwin amendment were to prevail it would prejudice the development of the project, since the scheme provides that the Federal Government can continue to make plans for the complete project and not segment it by having the Federal Government do a part of the job and the private utility the other. If the Baldwin amendment is adopted, it will erase the opportunity of the Federal Government to prosecute this project.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true. I appreciate the contribution of the capable and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who presided during the hearings on this project, and who ruled with consistent fairness and understanding of the issues involved.

I might say that construction economies should be considered in this project. If the powerplant is to be a part of the project, either private or public power, a tunnel and a tower must be made a part of the dam. These should be incorporated in the body of the dam itself, and not added as an afterthought at greater expense.

If the private power company takes over they will pay the cost. If they do not, the Federal Government will assume it. They will pay for it as it is constructed.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will keep this provision in the bill. I assure those men who come from coal-producing States that not one kilowatt of electricity will be produced, except by coal, because this will be a pumped storage station. The water will be pumped to the top of the mountain and brought back down through chutes and tunnels to produce electricity. Pumping will be done at night, when the load on the generators is light; the hydroelectric

generators will be operated during the day, when demand is at the peak. This will even out total demand over the full 24 hours.

I have been assured by the head of the utility that it will use union coal, and it will use our most plentiful natural resource.

I want to be sure that this project will be completed in full, not only the water control dam, but the appended powerplant. It is a project vital to the economic health of West Virginia. And I am convinced that the bill as written is the only way to assure its completion.

I say again I do not believe my good friend from California and my friend from Florida disagree with me as to what should be done; it is only a matter of approach.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. JONES of Alabama.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this section?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: Substitute the following language for the language on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This amendment had been considered and was subject to amendment under the previous amendment offered to strike this project.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The Chair will inform the gentleman from Alabama that the purpose of this amendment is to insert something other than that which was taken into consideration yesterday. So the point of order against this amendment is overruled.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this is practically the same as that which was offered yesterday as far as the St. John River project is concerned. In this

amendment the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

I have offered this amendment for the following reasons. In the New England area we now have thermonuclear power. If this amendment is defeated we will have a \$300 million water project using nothing but water. The thermonuclear powerplant in Connecticut which, of course, will be and is completely different from what is in this bill, uses today many, many thousands of tons of coal. So I ask your consideration today to strike out on page 41 lines 4 to 12 inclusive for this purpose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to be in opposition to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I recognize and respect his feelings with respect to this matter. He comes from a coal producing area. Members from some of those coal producing areas have found it desirable in some cases to oppose this project, I suppose upon the theory that the existing private power facilities in New England use coal and that a hydropower facility would be able to produce cheaper power than could be produced by coal.

However, just to authorize another survey of a project that has been studied for more than 30 years would be only to postpone the day of inevitable reckoning. This is not a solution.

The committee has thoroughly, carefully, and painstakingly heard both proponents and opponents. They have studied this project. Unlike most power projects, this one seems particularly warranted because of the great roadblock which lies across the trail of development for New England. This roadblock is the high price of power. New England industries pay 66 percent more for their power than do the average industries throughout the country. This is a terrible handicap to that area.

This project is the only opportunity we will have in this bill to make a meaningful, substantial contribution to the economic development of that historic section of our country which is New England. They have helped us on our projects. New England Congressmen have assisted the westerners in reclamation projects; they have assisted the southwesterners and the southerners and the midwesterners in our agricultural programs. They have assisted the west coast and the east coast and the gulf coast areas in beach erosion and hurricane protection projects. This is all they have asked for. This is their great need, for some measure of power at a price that people can pay.

Mr. Chairman, the average consumer in New England is required to pay 20 percent more for electric energy than is

the case throughout the rest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we faced this issue yesterday and there was admittedly a close vote. Normally I am not an advocate of public power, but in this instance where Chairman Joseph Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, found it necessary to chastise the private power interests in New England for not having produced modern, efficient, electric power generating capacity, where there have been years and years of study, years and years of opportunity for those private companies to come in and provide this demonstrable need for the people of New England and they have not done it, I see no justice in postponing the day of reckoning and putting it off and calling for another study. We have had study on top of study, ad infinitum, and there has been no action.

It is time for us to take a stand. I am going to stand today with New England because I think they have been too long denied.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I remained silent yesterday while the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to delete the Lincoln-Dickey part of the Passamaquoddy project was under consideration. I remained silent yesterday, but today I cannot remain silent. Misstatement of fact and distortion of motive have been too great. First of all, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] has blithely said he can see no reason why we oppose this. I want to remind the Members of the Committee that in the full Committee on Public Works, and surely all of the people of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union are entitled to know this, the vote for this project was 18 to 15, and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], joined with us, who felt this project is not justified on the facts and evidence which we have had before us.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has misinformed the Members of the Committee of the Whole when he said that this project has been studied for 30 long years. It is not true, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. Chairman, Passamaquoddy was studied for 30 long years, and this project is only part of Passamaquoddy. At the last moment when the administrative agencies involved, even this administration, could not put their stamp of approval on Passamaquoddy, then they lopped off this part of Passamaquoddy—and not such a little part at that, \$300 million worth of Passamaquoddy was lopped off, and here it is.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been full and complete public hearings held on this particular project, standing on its own two feet. These 30 years of hearings about which they talk have been the 30 years of hearings on the ill-fated Passamaquoddy project as a whole, of which this Lincoln-Dickey project is but one part. There has never been a true hearing on Lincoln-Dickey by itself. This was tacked on, on the floor of the other body without debate, without real

discussion, and without hearings in the Senate, and came to our Public Works Committee.

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows how busy the Committee on Public Works has been lately with the Economic Development Act, the Highway Beautification Act, and other important matters. It came to our committee and there was never an opportunity to have full and complete hearings on it.

Mr. Chairman, it is not fair to say that this matter has been heard and reheard, studied and restudied. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is leaning backward in fairness when he proposes that this Lincoln-Dickey project be given a study, with the directive that the study come back next March, no later than next March, so the House can work its will at that time in trying to be fair.

Mr. Chairman, for those on the majority side who are keenly aware of the importance of being fair in the legislative process, here is an amendment they can support in good faith, because this project has never been really studied before. Based on figures we are given here, the need for a study is real. There has been distortion of facts and figures that should stand the test of study.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I want to mention in respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in New England, but I want to tell the gentleman from Texas that New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the entire United States—less than 2 percent. I think we people in New England are well qualified to make our own decision as to whether or not we want unnecessary public power which costs more than our own taxpayer utilities can produce it for.

Mr. Chairman, as welfare program after welfare program has marched through this House, again and again I have heard gentlemen from the other side of the aisle rise in righteous wrath and say, "Let us pass this legislation so that we will make taxpayers out of these tax eaters on the welfare rolls."

Well and truly said, Mr. Chairman, and I agree. But why now are they trying to downgrade and denigrate the tax-paying utility and put in its place a tax-eating monstrosity? Costly, outdated, and inefficient, it makes no economic sense; it makes no sense at all. Let us be consistent, let us give the taxpayers of this country a break.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Is not one of the crux issues in this whole matter that the Secretary of the Interior desires to get this project through which is really the beginning of his effort to try to get a national grid system established in the northeastern United States under the control of the Federal Government, no matter what we have in the Northwest

and other places? Is that not the real issue behind this effort?

Mr. HARSHA. I think that is absolutely right.

Mr. CRAMER. It is true, may I ask the gentleman, that the Atomic Energy Commission indicated that a project that would be one-fifth of the cost of the proposed hydroelectric project could be built in New England, and I am reading from page 244 of the report on the bill.

Mr. HARSHA. I think that is right.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time we set the record straight on the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Dickey-Lincoln is a new quicky proposal that emerged as an expediency in order to open up New England for public power. It is a part of the much discredited international Passamaquoddy tidal project and is an indirect means of getting the unfeasible Passamaquoddy project approved, piecemeal. As a separate isolated power project, contrary to what my friend from Texas says, Dickey has neither been studied nor has it followed the procedures set forth by law for presentation of a project proposal for authorization by the Congress.

The 1944 Flood Control Act requires that project proposals be submitted to States and affected agencies for comment and review. As a separate project, the Dickey proposal was never submitted to the States and the agencies for review and comment. It was submitted as a combination of the Passamaquoddy project to be constructed and operated on an entirely different basis than the project now proposed, and no information has been presented to the States and the agencies for review and comment on this new basis. Is the Congress now to violate its own rules with respect to this particular project in authorizing a proposal which has not been studied on its own merits and which has not followed the statutory requirements. Not only have we failed to follow the statutory requirements, but this project is inconsistent with the basic philosophy of Federal power development.

One of the fundamentals of that philosophy as expressed in Senate Document No. 97 which is the bible, so to speak, for the procedure in approving these projects by the Corps of Engineers—that fundamental is that the proposal must be the cheapest and most effective alternative. The record is replete with evidence that this is not the cheapest and most effective alternative.

Now we have heard arguments that there is a great need for additional electricity in this New England region. The Federal Power Commission reports on electric power supply, as late as April 30 of this year, indicate a reserve of more than 25 percent in this area. This certainly refutes the argument that there is a shortage of power in that area.

Further, the argument has been advanced that this power will be cheap power and will cause industry to move into the area. This is just not so. The cost of power as an increment of product value, as shown by the 1960 annual survey of manufacturers conducted by the Census Bureau, averages only 0.84 percent of all manufacturing. I repeat,

power averages less than 1 percent of the cost of production. The highest occurred in the chemicals and allied products industry which averaged only 2.4 percent and next were primary metals which averaged 1.9 percent. The relationship of power cost to product value has been going down over the years because of low power cost and the increasing prices of other materials. Power costs are actually insignificant in a decision to locate industry in a particular area. The primary considerations are labor and transportation costs in getting, not only raw materials to the plants, but in transporting processed products to and from the market.

And now as to whether or not this is cheap power, I would point out that Charles Robinson, engineer and counsel of the National Rural Electrification Association, who can hardly be classified as a private power exponent, says in his testimony before the Public Works Committee that the average of all power purchased in Maine is 13.9 mills and for Vermont 9.4 mills. He also says in his testimony that the annual cost of producing this power at Dickey-Lincoln would be \$14.6 million. In order to obtain \$14.6 million annually to meet the cost of production of this power, the power would have to be sold at 15½ mills.

Now this may be low cost power to you, gentlemen, but I submit that when it is about 2 to 6 mills above what is presently being charged, I fail to see how this will ever reduce power rates in that area. The people of Maine cannot afford this "cheap" power.

Nor can the U.S. taxpayer afford to finance this project to the tune of \$300 million.

I urge this Committee to adopt this substitute and to uphold the statutory and procedural requirements of Congress. Let us give this project a hearing and study on its own merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, I rise in opposition to the amendment submitted by our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of our committee.

I want to say this particular project was heard a year ago in the Senate. There was no need for further hearings in the Senate. The hearings that were held on the House side were full hearings. We held hearings and we heard every witness who wanted to appear.

Certainly the project that was brought before our committee was a project that had been well studied. Our late President Kennedy asked for this project to be studied and our present President, President Johnson asked for the same.

This project is located on an international stream between the State of Maine and Canada. This particular project had met all of the criteria of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and it had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Now I am sure that all projects come up in the same manner for consideration before our various committees. Serving

on the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs and also on the Committee on Public Works, I know this to be a fact. You must receive the support of the agencies and they must meet the criteria laid down by the Congress. The projects must have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. This particular project had just that. Every witness was heard from.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did we not have the approval of the Governor of Maine, Gov. John H. Reed?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, Governor Reed came here and testified in support of this project as did both of their Members of Congress and I understand the like membership in the other body were in support of this project.

This particular dam is on the St. John River. It is going to utilize a resource—water—that is flowing down that river. It needs to be controlled on this side of the border and it needs to be controlled on the other side of the border. President Johnson made this request in the light that they would perfect an intertie in this particular area. We have just finished perfecting an intertie in the Pacific Northwest, the Southwest, and in the western part of the United States and the private utilities are going to be the biggest benefactors of that intertie. Certainly the private utilities in this area would have a very important benefit and part in this particular project. I am certain that if this is built, the utilities there would be brought into it as far as marketing the power and transmitting the power. If the intertie is perfected between the two countries, they would be a part of it.

In Canada there is also a need for river regulation and power generation.

I know that there is no low-cost power in the New England States. The power costs there are the highest of any place in the United States. This would be the first time that we had a Federal public development that would offer low-cost power to the people of Maine. We have had this fight throughout the United States. Wherever we have had one of these projects—and I cite the Missouri River Basin, TVA, the Bonneville project, the CVP project in the Central Valley of California, the Southeast and the Southwest power authorities—they are all working for the best interests of the people of the United States.

The private utilities are getting along very fine. They are taking from those projects a large proportion of the power and passing it on to other people as local consumers. Certainly when the people of Maine come down here in force and support this project that has been approved by all the Federal agencies—and it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget—I say that we should not set the project aside for further study. It has been studied. There is no need for further study. This project will pay itself out in 50 years with interest to the Federal Government, because 98 percent of it is power and that money will come

back to the Federal Government, the same as with other great projects we have approved across the Nation. All power facilities are reimbursable with interest.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New Hampshire has given a rather impassioned plea, repeating the timeworn argument that the private power companies make against this very valuable project in my State of Maine.

Again, let me say that the people of the State of Maine need this project. They need it desperately to lower the cost of power in our State. There are only two of us in the House of Representatives—my friend, BILL HATHAWAY on the Democratic side and myself on the Republican side—and I certainly hope that the Members will give Maine this assist today, so that we can help ourselves develop industry in our State.

I should like to tell the membership a little bit about what the private power companies in the State of Maine have done in the past: they have attempted to strangle industrial development in my State. I speak with some knowledge on this subject because I was once, as commissioner of fisheries in Maine, an ex officio member of the Maine Development Commission.

Gentlemen, guess who was in charge of the Maine Development Commission? Always one of the executives of one of the Maine power companies. In that sensitive position they were able to keep industry from our State, and allow industry to grow only as the power companies grew, and not vice versa.

Gentlemen, I appear here today to implore you to give us a hand with this project that is so badly needed. Our young men are leaving the State of Maine. I have a 23-year-old son who himself may have to leave the State of Maine in order to support his wife and his three children. Maine Representatives have given support to many projects in various sections of the Nation over past years. Today we ask that you reciprocate.

I notice that over \$11 billion has been spent on these projects west of the Mississippi. Over \$5.550 billion east of the Mississippi and south of the Mason-Dixon line has been spent. Yet in all of New England only \$413 million has been spent, and out of that only \$19,388,000 has been spent for the Pinetree State of Maine. I beg your consideration for the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. I would like to point out to the Committee certain testimony concerning this issue of power costs. Mr. Charles Robinson, the engineer and counsel of the Natural Rural Electrification Association, who can hardly be classified as a private power advocate, stated in his testimony before the Committee on Public Works that the average of all power purchased in Maine is pur-

chased at a cost of 13.9 mills, and for Vermont it is 9.4 mills.

He also says in his testimony that the annual cost of producing this power at Dickey-Lincoln would be \$14.6 million. In order to obtain \$14.6 million annually to meet this cost of production, the power would have to be sold at 15½ mills. This may be low-cost power to some, but I submit that when it is about 2 to 6 mills above what is presently being charged I fail to see how such "cheap" power will ever reduce the power rates in that area. The reason the power rates now charged in New England are somewhat higher than other areas is the high cost of transportation of coal to the power facility. A contract has already been awarded to GE to construct a nuclear powerplant in Connecticut to serve this area which would provide much cheaper power, not only than coal but also much cheaper than this hydro project. High cost public power is not going to reduce the rates to New England. It just is not possible to sell the Dickey-Lincoln power at less than 15½ mills and recover the annual production costs of this power of some \$14.6 million. The construction of this project will raise the costs of power to New Englanders rather than lower it.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. The comments on that appear on pages 242, 243, and 244 of the supplemental views in the report on the legislation.

There is not any question that the power will be sold at a price in excess of the present power cost, according to the REA Chairman in that area, Mr. Robinson. So this cheap power argument does not hold water.

The House might as well be on notice. This is what will happen. Secretary Udall of the Department of the Interior wants to establish a grid system in the northeastern part of the United States. They have not been able to do so to date. This is where they want to start. The reason they have to start here is because this power cannot be sold in the area where it is produced. The majority report even says so. This power is going to be produced on the St. John River in Maine and sold elsewhere, because the users are not available in that area. That means the Federal Government will have to go into Federal power transmission, with the beginning of a grid system.

The Passamaquoddy project has never been, as a whole project, approved by any department or by any agency of the Federal Government, because it is so bad, because the cost is so high, and because the benefits are so little.

I have served on the Committee on Public Works for 11 years. I have never known of such a project being approved by the Congress of the United States. It is supposedly a multiple-purpose project. It is admitted by the majority report on the proposal that there is very little relationship to flood control.

Flood control is supposed to be and has traditionally been how we get into these things. Power is supposed to be secondary and incidental. We get into these multiple-purpose projects of flood control and power, but power is not the prin-

cial consideration. Flood control is how we get into these things.

How much of this is flood control? I ask Members to listen. How much? I have never seen a project with so little flood control on multiple-purpose usage. Here it is: Two-tenths of 1 percent. Two-tenths of 1 percent for flood control is to eventually cost the taxpayers of America \$300 million because of the power features.

That is the only way we get into this project, yet it involves only two-tenths of 1 percent. Two percent of it is for what? It is for nothing relating to rivers and harbors or flood control, but it is rather a new gimmick brought into these projects to try to make them feasible—area redevelopment. It has nothing to do with the development of water resources in America.

For two-tenths of 1 percent for flood control we are asked to vote for nearly \$300 million of Federal expenditures for something that is a power project, to provide power where it is not even needed.

The issue is simple. This is a project which is being taken out of order of usual flood control procedures. This is a project which has not conformed to the usual criteria of our committee. This is a project which has not been approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as a separate project. I will accept a challenge on that from anybody. This is a project which has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as a separate project.

This project came in as a part of the international Passamaquoddy tidal project. Passamaquoddy was such a bad project in total that when the report on it was submitted to the administration, as set forth to the Secretary of the Interior from the Passamaquoddy-St. John River Study Committee in 1964, it was so bad, they were so critical in their comments, and it was so accurately exposed as to fundamental defects in the plan, that construction of this project had to be abandoned. It was admittedly uneconomical.

They took one segment of it which has never gone through the Corps of Army Engineers and which has never gone through the procedures and the requirements of law. It has been brought up as a separate type of procedure, in order to try to force the beginning of Passamaquoddy and a national grid system. We cannot do that to the taxpayers of America to the tune of \$300 million, for two-tenths of 1 percent flood-control protection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this project and against this amendment. This amendment is just a camouflage. There is not any sincere proposal that has been made to the committee to study an atomic energy plant in Maine. There has not been any such proposal before the committee at all. Any atomic energy plant that has been recommended, for example, before our committee has been somewhere in the lower part of New England. There has never been any con-

tention that atomic energy plants could be or would be comparable to harnessing the St. John River in Maine.

Here is a river that has been flowing to the sea wasting its energy for all time. This is a great resource that renews itself constantly. It is a feasible project according to the historical standards of our committee. The Corps of Engineers testified that it had a favorable benefit-cost ratio. More than anything else they testified to the great need of the State of Maine for some low-cost power.

When this body is told that there will be low-cost power from the private power companies, they are not giving the real facts. The private power companies can and do boast that they will produce electric energy cheaper, but that is not what they are going to sell it for. They will sell it at as high a price as they can possibly get. That has been their history, and they will not change that history. I was one on the committee who asked for testimony from the private power companies. I was one of those on the committee who asked the private power companies what the price would be of their so-called cheap power for the people. Their spokesman said he would not tell us. He found out from others on the committee that the committee did not like that kind of an answer. So he went home and burned the midnight oil and came back with some figures which demonstrated that his company certainly and other companies in New England for whom he was speaking were not talking about reducing the rate for power even by 1980 to anything comparable to the Dickey project.

This Dickey project was testified to by Secretary Udall and others who represented that it would have power produced at 7 mills per kilowatt. That is what it would be sold for. Even with all of the reductions promised by the New England power companies as of 1980, they will only testify to an average reduction of about 9.7 mills. That will bring their power rates down to 14.5 mills from where it is now on an average of 24.2 mills.

For 30 years this river has been studied along with other projects in an attempt to relieve the State of Maine and the New England area from the onerous burden they carry of power rates. For pretty near all that time the State of Maine has suffered from an exodus of population. This is the kind of burden that we share in some areas in my part of the country in the West.

For these reasons I beg you to give attention to the problems of Maine by helping them to develop this great resource.

You know, a great deal is said about buying or selling coal to develop electric energy, but when you get all through mining it, you have ruined the resource. All you have is a hole in the ground that you have to tend to forever. Here is a river that is renewing itself constantly that will produce power cheaper for the consumer than any project testified to before the committee, whether it is public or private, in the New England area. I think that we are just dutybound to the people of the State of Maine to develop this cheap, low-cost energy for them so that they can develop other resources of their great country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is discussing power rates. Could he tell us what the power rates would be in the Tennessee Valley if it were not for the TVA in the Southwest or Northwest if it were not for the great hydroelectric power developments in those areas and elsewhere in the country?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. We took testimony in the committee as to the great reductions that have occurred in power rates from our yardstick furnished by Bonneville, and our yardstick furnished by TVA, and those yardsticks furnished everywhere by public power. We found this was the thing that made the development of new resources and new industries possible in every other area of the United States.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I shall not take up much of your time. You heard my comments yesterday in favor of this project which would be located in my district. It is very interesting to hear the gentleman from New Hampshire say that he has only a 2-percent unemployment rate. I congratulate him on that.

In the State of Maine the unemployment rate is much higher. In the very area where this dam will be located one-third of the families make less than \$3,000 a year. As a matter of fact about half of the population of my district is located in area redevelopment areas.

The gentleman pointed out in the report the statement that the power rates would appear to be higher, if you average out figures, by about 2 mills. He says it will be 15.5 to 13.3, but he did not tell you that 80 percent of this power will be used as peaking power, at \$15.50 per kilowatt-year for capacity and 3 mills for energy. That is at least 25 percent less than the nuclear alternative to produce the same power.

Under the marketing of this power the full amount of money will be repaid to the Federal Government so that in effect the \$300 million, about which you have heard over and over again as going down the drain will not be going down the drain. The entire amount of money, with interest, will be returned.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in conclusion that I appreciate very much the comments of the members of the committee. I join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] in saying that yesterday the opposition had their day in court. They are sorry they lost. I think they are simply sore losers in offering this amendment, and I urge the Members to vote against the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate today considerable emphasis was placed on the fact that New England is a high-cost power area and that the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project was the answer to this problem. It is true that power costs in New England are high but to suggest that the Dickey-Lincoln project, or a series of them, will provide the answer to that problem is absolutely ridiculous.

This project is nothing but a mid-sixties WPA that will provide expensive power. Of course, the Government will write off so much of the costs that the true economics of the plan are not even mentioned. However, it is quite clear that alternate sources of power, either with nuclear energy or fossil fuels, can provide more power for a fraction of the cost. It is here proposed to spend over \$300 million to build a powerplant 400 miles from the load center when the Yankee atomic plant, built several years ago, can produce more power than Dickey-Lincoln and that project cost only \$38 million.

Now, I know the Secretary of the Interior has urged the construction of this project but I do not consider him an expert in nuclear power matters. I do wish he had examined the advisability of atomic energy being provided to New England but his lack of study of such an alternative leaves me bewildered. On page 423 of the hearings he indicated that he had no knowledge of any proposed atomic plants for New England or even if we had any nuclear plants located there now. He should have known that we not only have several projects proposed now but in the Yankee plant at Rowe, Mass., we have, over a period of 5 years, produced more atomic power than any other atomic plant in the world.

I have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 6 years. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I was interested in serving on the Joint Committee because of the military applications of atomic energy. However, I was also prompted to serve on the committee because of the high power costs in New England and I hoped that my service on the committee might help hasten the day when our power costs, derived from either nuclear or fossil fuels, would be competitive with other sections of this country. That day has arrived and, in fact, the future is even more promising.

The Atomic Energy Commission has this week provided me with information that indicates, for a plant entering service in 1969, which is before the Dickey-Lincoln project would become a reality, that the cost of electricity by atomic power would be considerably less than that provided by the Dickey project. Starting with a plant about 200,000-kilowatt capacity and increasing in size to 1 million kilowatts, we would find that costs would vary between 6 mills and 3.75 mills, compared to at least 8 mills for Dickey-Lincoln for preference customers. The costs of these plants would be about \$200 a kilowatt for a plant of about 200,000 kilowatts to about \$100 a kilowatt for a plant of 800,000 kilowatts. In fact, I was advised that this data is over a year

old and "if updated for today's market prices and conditions would be somewhat more favorable for nuclear power." A revolution is occurring in the civilian atomic energy field. As of January 1965, after 15 years of development work, there was only 1,000 megawatts of nuclear capacity in operation, and about 2,500 megawatts on order. However, in the past few months orders were placed for over 3,000 megawatts of additional capacity. In other words, sales in the past few months have equaled the total for the last 15 years. It is interesting to note that New England is leading the entire country in this effort. Latest figures also indicate that coal and oil can also produce power cheaper than that which the proponents claim for Dickey-Lincoln.

I intend to support the amendment to have this project deleted from this bill because, first, it will obviously produce very expensive power; second, there are cheaper ways to produce power in New England; third, there is no market for this power which is 400 miles away from the load center; and fourth, excepting for its WPA nature will not inure to the benefit of New England. With the marked advances in power technology here and on the horizon, it would not be wise to proceed with this inflexible, high cost project which is expensive to the taxpayer and unresponsive to the need for lower power costs in New England.

As an indication of the serious questions in the minds of the people I represent, I am enclosing herewith some newspaper editorials on this subject:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, July 10, 1965]

POWER AND WATER

Does it make any sense for the Federal Government to put a huge, extravagant power project in the wilds of Maine?

Washington seems to think so, as it continues to come up with proposals for hydroelectric projects in northern Maine.

While President Johnson last week expressed concern over the urgent water problem in New England, the Government's desire for a hydroelectric plant completely overlooks the possibilities of a New England project that could provide power for the region and add to our water supplies by desalinization of sea water, both through nuclear energy.

The dreamed-of Passamaquoddy Bay tidal powerplant—under discussion for four decades—now has been laid to rest for the time being. Even Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall now concedes that the Quoddy plan he recommended in 1963 now is no longer economically feasible.

Instead, the Government now proposes a \$227 million hydroelectric power project in northern Maine at the Lincoln School-Dickey site just above the confluence of the St. John and Allagash Rivers. Secretary Udall claims the plan would not flood the Allagash River, thus preserving one of the Nation's few remaining wild river areas, and would provide cheap power for all of New England.

This action is not unexpected. In fact, for some time now, New England utility interests have suspected that the Government was introducing the Quoddy project as a straw man, with the intention of introducing a smaller-scaled hydroelectric plan at the Dickey site once the critics had demolished the Quoddy proposals.

The latest recommendation is far less ambitious than the billion-dollar Quoddy plan. But it is still open to some of the objections raised against Quoddy.

In the nuclear age it seems incredible that the Government wants to put a hydroelectric plant so far from New England's population centers. This means, of course, that if New England is to benefit from power generated on the St. John River, transmission lines will have to be strung for hundreds of miles.

This seems obviously uneconomic when the costs of electricity produced by nuclear plants have been dropping steadily and are not far from being cheaper than conventionally produced power. And nuclear powerplants have proven to be safe enough for location near centers of population.

For example, Commonwealth Edison Co., in Chicago, is now building the Nation's largest atomic power station. The 700,000-kilowatt unit is estimated to cost \$76 million. Compare that with the Government's St. John River proposal of a 794,000-kilowatt unit costing \$227 million.

The new nuclear plant is expected to generate and deliver power to the Chicago area at a cost 5 to 10 percent lower than Commonwealth Edison's new conventional units under construction.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has predicted that large nuclear power plants (more than 500,000 kilowatts) probably will be able to produce electricity costing about 4 to 5 mills per kilowatt-hour and lower. Secretary Udall says power from the St. John River project could be delivered to preference customers in Maine for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. What the cost would be to other New England customers, for instance in Boston, is unclear.

But at any rate, by the time the St. John River project could be completed it might be utterly obsolete because of advances in nuclear power technology.

Also to be considered is the possibility of a dual-purpose atomic plant, producing power and purifying sea water for consumption.

Dr. Seaborg, in a copyrighted interview in U.S. News & World Report, says: "We are particularly interested in the so-called dual-purpose reactors—that is, reactors that produce electricity and at the same time use the waste heat, which would otherwise be dissipated, to desalt water. By the 1980's we expect that there will be huge dual-purpose reactors. Reactors that would be developing a thousand megawatts—that is, a million kilowatts—of electricity, or more, and perhaps desalting water to the extent of 500 million gallons a day."

Such a plant would be ideal for New England of course, which is waking up to the fact that its water supplies are inadequate.

The Government's interest in a big, public hydroelectric project Down East seems to make less and less sense when viewed against the potentialities of nuclear power. While the Government has cited the benefits of low-cost power as a boon to New England industry and as a way of stimulating the economy of depressed northern Maine, unfortunately it has not shown the same solicitude for New England by continuing unreasonable quotas on imports of residual fuel oil which force power companies to pay more for this fuel used in generating electricity.

Instead of concentrating its studies on Maine rivers and bays, the Government should turn its attention to what nuclear power could do for the region.

[From the Haverhill Gazette, Aug. 26, 1965]

POWER VERSUS WATER

Representatives of New England's investor-owned power companies, fighting proposed legislation for creation of a Federal hydroelectric power station in northern Maine, are making some strong arguments in their opposition stand.

They have argued in congressional hearings that the existing companies, constantly improving their service and building more

nuclear stations, are providing power now even more cheaply than the Government can produce it.

There are many who feel, of course, the Government has no business producing power in the first place, that this is another step toward socialism.

Others who oppose the project base their opposition on the advantages that might be lost to Maine if the power facility floods areas that are potentially of great recreational value.

New England already has plenty of electrical power, and the private firms are constantly expanding to keep up with the demand. It is the view of many persons who have looked into the situation that the Federal Government could put its \$300 million into something New England lacks, instead of something it already has.

Take water resources, for instance. This area has a shortage during this drought because States and communities have not properly conserved their water supplies. Beyond that—and this is where it could affect Haverhill and the Merrimack Valley—our rivers are among the worst in the Nation where pollution is concerned.

If persons in Washington who want to spend money in New England would direct their efforts toward providing funds for pollution control, they would be doing us a far greater favor than they could ever do by building another power dam in northern Maine.

The advantages of cleaning rivers would be apparent in far shorter time than any powerplant in the forests of Maine. Since rivers like the Merrimack are interstate waterways, and since it is the Federal Government which is making the most noise about their conditions, it would seem Washington has the prime obligation to provide the funds for such projects.

It would be far better for the Federal Government to relieve taxpayers in Haverhill and other communities of the staggering bills for cleaning rivers than to intrude on the province of private enterprise by going into the electrical business.

We'll be glad to get that Federal money if Congress just can't resist spending it.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1965]

ST. JOHN GIFT HORSE

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, is furious with the New England Council for opposing the construction of a \$227 million Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School on Maine's St. John River.

This is understandable, because the Senator has worked hard to steer the huge public works project through the Upper Chamber (as a rider to the rivers and harbors bill) and he does not want to lose it in the House, where it is now pending. A lot of jobs are involved, and the project could mean much to northern Maine's non-too-healthy economy.

Nevertheless, we are disposed to side with the council—at least until the facts are explored a little more.

For if Maine would gain something from the project, it and the whole New England region would lose something, too. The Dickey-Lincoln School project, while sparing the Allagash wilderness, would destroy a vast natural recreation area along the St. John. And in the long run these unique recreation areas may be more valuable to Maine than cheap hydroelectric power.

Testimony before the House committee this month raised a serious question whether power produced at the Dickey-Lincoln School site would be economically competitive with that now being produced by private utilities here, and this admittedly is not cheap.

Many people believe that within the next decade or so atomic power will provide the

answer to all New England's electric problems, including its cost problems, in which case the St. John River project will certainly become obsolete. Does the region really want to destroy another great natural asset on the off chance that this will not happen.

We think that the New England Council has a point and that Congress should take a long second look before approving this doubtful project.

[From the Salem (Mass.) Evening News, Aug. 20, 1965]

WHY GO BACKWARD?

Lower rates for electricity in the New England area are predicted through the gradual harnessing of atomic power. A rate drop of 30 percent within the next 15 years is expected, a Federal Power Commission study reveals. Use of nuclear energy is the modern trend, moving New England away from dependence upon high cost fuels. Combining the rapid technological progress in the atomic power field with the economies of new pumped storage installations is expected to cut electric rates almost one-third by 1980.

Now that atomic power looms as the means of liberating New England from the burden of expensive electric production it would seem that everyone should rejoice at the prospect of reduced electric rates. But not so. There rises on the congressional horizon the bogey of a Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. The Government plans to sink \$300 million of the taxpayers' money in a hydroelectric system that is rapidly becoming obsolescent before the rise of atomic fuel.

Is it progress to turn back to an old-fashioned method of electric production? Especially when the Federal project would be incapable of bringing power to the New England region at a production cost as low as that of systems using nuclear power plants and pumped storage stations.

The Federal project can only result in retarding development of the nuclear power industry on which New England relies as the only practical means of cutting electric rates. Seven atomic powerplants already are in operation or underway. The Yankee plant at Rowe in the past year produced more power from a \$40 million private investment than the unnecessary Maine project would produce in 1971, when its completion is scheduled.

By 1980 at least 7,500,000 kilowatts of atomic power will be available in the area from atomic plants.

As for the power output of the Maine project, no marketing plan exists although 90 percent of the power would be used outside of Maine. The power would be too expensive for New England utilities to buy. And the whole project would return not a dollar in tax revenues. Then why build it?

The millions sought total about 10 percent of the huge public works omnibus bill already okayed by the Senate. A rush of protests from constituents to their Congressmen would help House Members decide that the issue deserves a lot more study.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item, Aug. 21, 1965]

WHAT PRICE NORTHEAST POWER?

Congress should take a hard and hesitant look at a current bill which seeks a \$220 million authorization for construction of a Federal power project at Dickey-Lincoln School in Maine. It is a measure that deserves defeat and we hope our New England congressional delegation will lead the way in rejecting it.

The stated goal of this project is to bring low-cost power to the New England region at an apparent expected cost of 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. Actually, some Northeast sources of power are now at less than 6 mills

and by 1971, when the Maine project would be operative, public utilities would be producing power at about 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour through use of nuclear powerplants and pumped storage stations.

The Dickey-Lincoln scheme is basically a case of the Government spending more money to build a power producing plant than would be done by private companies for a plant of the same capacity. The resultant cost from the Government-owned operation would be greater than that from the privately-owned plant. And, finally, no taxes would be paid in local areas where the plant is located because the Maine project would not contribute a single tax dollar at local, State, or Federal levels. A privately owned plant would pay full taxes.

It is all too reminiscent of another Passamaquoddy dream—and at a cost that would be approximately seven times greater than the projected tunnel between England and France. There's no need in New England for a TVA-style Government venture when private interests can do it better—and at much less cost.

[From the Gloucester Times, Aug. 27, 1965]

DICKEY-LINCOLN WON'T CUT OUR POWER COSTS

The proposed Federal hydroelectric plant on the St. John River near the Maine-Canadian border may seem remote from Massachusetts. It isn't. The so-called Dickey-Lincoln School electric project wants to sell its power as far south as the Boston area.

Maine legislators are jubilant at the prospect of the Federal Government spending \$302 million (including \$75 million for transmission lines). They feel the project will not only help unemployment for a few years during the construction period, it will open up and develop the vast Maine forests. Instead of a preserve for lumber companies and a few hardy sportsmen, the area will draw commerce and industry. (At present 16 corporations and 4 families own 75 percent of the sparsely populated woodland in the northern half of Maine.)

The New England Governors have endorsed the project. The basic reasoning seems to be—"Let's get this Federal money. If we don't, Texas or points south and west will."

After examining the pros and cons we cannot endorse the Dickey-Lincoln project. We can't see how it is going to lower power costs for New England. We think the best approach to lower power cost is through atomic electric plants.

The various classes of electricity users in New England pay between 9 and 40 percent above the national average. To turn the generators that make electricity, New England must import coal and oil. The coal and oil lobby in Washington has also been successful in curbing imports of low-cost residual oil into New England.

But let's get down to facts and figures. The Government promises it will deliver wholesale electricity to Boston for 7 to 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. But the New England Power Co. says its Salem, Mass., plant is producing wholesale electricity right now at 6 to 7 mills. The new plant at Brayton Point is producing electricity at 6 mills.

The Boston Edison Co. has a plant producing at about 6 mills. Admittedly these are the most efficient of the conventional plants.

The Federal planners didn't even bother to consult the private utilities about possible sales of power. The utilities say they are not interested at the 7- to 8-mill price. They are already doing better than that in their newest plants.

It seems to us the advocates of the Dickey-Lincoln project have overlooked the facts in the rapidly developing atomic field. Atomic produced electric power was pioneered at the

Rowe, Mass., plant. Although this experimental plant produces electricity at 9 mills, the plant now under construction at Haddam, Conn., expects to turn out electricity at between 6 and 7 mills. This includes paying Federal, State, and local taxes.

According to a publication of the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston, the Jersey Central Power & Light Co., based on the builder's bid, expects to produce electricity from an atomic plant at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Federal Reserve publication says most authorities now believe only atomic electric plants will be built in New England during the next 10 years. Even with a 150-percent increase in New England electric usage by 1980, atomic plants will supply all the base-load needs for the region. Boston Edison has four bids on an atomic plant under consideration. The trend is clear.

For the peak period (from dark to about 11 p.m.), the private utilities have worked out a system of pumped storage. After midnight when power use drops, the atomic plants will be kept going and the power sent to privately owned hydroelectric dams. The offpeak power will be used to pump water below the dam back into the reservoir. The next evening when the peak demand starts at 5 p.m., the water will be released and the power recovered at the time it is needed.

Here are some startling figures. The electric companies say that it would only cost them \$71 million to produce 794,000 kilowatts of power if the atomic plant and pumped storage system were used. To get that amount of power and distribute it, the Federal Government proposes to spend \$302 million for Dickey-Lincoln in Maine. The Federal project is tax free, but the utilities have figured in all their taxes and interest charges.

It seems clear, that if the Federal Government or anyone else wants to get into the New England power business it should build atomic plants.

The cities and towns of New England should remember how much property tax revenue they get from the private utilities. The New England Power Co. which supplies our area and others rank in the top 5 taxpayers in 219 municipalities. In 131 of those cities and towns it is the largest taxpayer. Our hard-pressed municipalities can't afford to lose that kind of tax revenue.

The Federal Government's famous TVA project in Tennessee can be justified because at the time it was built, the private power companies didn't have the money and weren't interested. New England utilities are pioneers in the use of atomic energy and have proven they are interested. Atomic energy will soon cut our power costs if we let the utilities do it. Dickey-Lincoln won't.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the well-known news analyst, Eric Sevareid, recently returned to Washington from important overseas assignments. Last Tuesday, in the Washington Evening Star, Mr. Sevareid had an interesting editorial column entitled "Time for a Pause To Reflect." In the column he said:

The American political capital is in dire need of the pause that reflects, even if it does not refresh. People are intellectually exhausted, but don't know it. They are not allowed to feel it, because events and the President won't let them.

Even God rested on the seventh day, and since it would be presumptuous to think

that He got tired, one has to assume He paused to reflect on what He had done.

It is true this 89th Congress has already enacted an awesome list of far-reaching legislation. Only time will give a true picture of its wisdom and implication on the Nation and the people. The magnitude of this legislation has even prompted our able young colleague from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the president of the organization of first-term Members from the other side of the aisle, to write a note to the President saying: "It is time to pause."

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today another major landmark in this stream of measures, the 1965 rivers and harbors and flood control bill. As stewards of our Nation's wealth and resources, we are again being called upon to decide what is in the best long-range interest of all our people.

We, the Congress, have been chosen by the votes of conscientious American citizens to represent them in accepting the tremendous responsibility of making the laws which affect them and their resources. Each succeeding bill sharpens the issue of whether we would be reducing or expanding or managing wisely the remaining balance of resources available to meet the Nation's needs in the years ahead. Consequently, the importance of sound decisions—and the inherent danger of shortcuts—increases geometrically with the effect these decisions have on the remaining balance of resources. I hope and pray that history will not find America wanting because of unwise actions we might take.

Mr. Chairman, great publicity has been given by the executive branch over the past year to its efforts to eliminate waste in Government. God knows how badly that is needed. But, the real issue with which the Congress of the United States should be wrestling is whether we are achieving the most efficient allocation of our resources, material and human. This involves, first, a clear cataloging of available resources, present and future, and second, a determination, on a priority basis, of our greatest needs as a people. It involves formulation of creative and imaginative plans for meeting such needs and the ascertainment and evaluation of the resulting consequences of each possible alternative. Achieving the most efficient allocation of our resources also involves analysis and choice between existing programs and new proposals, between investment and current expense, between accomplishment by Government and by private enterprise. Such program evaluations are fundamental to attainment of wise and meaningful conclusions. The manner and degree of the use of the Nation's resources will determine whether we are to become a "have" or a "have not" nation.

Mr. Chairman, the 1965 rivers and harbors and flood control bill, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, includes a number of proposals which have not been tested adequately against the principles of sound stewardship I have just mentioned. I question whether it is in the best interest of ourselves, the Nation, and future generations to take the gamble these projects involve. There

are three points in particular I wish to discuss.

First. Title I provides for the planning of a vast new complex of water storage, conveyance, and purification works to be accomplished solely by the Federal Government through the Corps of Engineers. This extensive new scheme comes almost immediately on the heels of the Water Resources Planning Act—Public Law 89-80—approved July 22, 1965. The principles embodied in the Water Resources Planning Act have been studied for decades and the concept of that law has had the support of at least the last four administrations. That act clearly declares it to be "the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned," rather than having comprehensive water resources planned unilaterally by one agency. The Water Resources Planning Act provides for establishment of river basin commissions to prepare and coordinate these comprehensive plans.

The need for studies of long-range water requirements of the Northeastern United States is unquestioned. But, the proposed authorization for a unilateral Federal study by the Corps of Engineers represents a complete reversal of the policy of comprehensive and coordinated planning, expressed in a law hardly 2 months old. I think it is unprecedented and the height of frivolity to assign full responsibility to one Federal agency for providing all facilities, including a new function never before considered a Federal activity—purification and treatment works—with the attendant abdication by all other Federal agencies as well as States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others as described in Public Law 89-80, without detailed analysis, evaluation, and hearing. Such a sudden major reversal of the studies and travail which resulted in the enactment of Public Law 89-80 would be shocking. Certainly the conception in that law should be given a fair opportunity to prove itself, or should be, at least, assaulted directly, not covertly, so that all can understand what is at stake.

Second. Section 201(a) of title II of the bill would give blanket authority to the Corps of Engineers to construct any water resource development project if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than \$10 million. Appropriations for prosecution of the work could not be made unless approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

For 145 years the Congress has insisted on specific authorization of major works of the Corps of Engineers. Without careful examination of the need and justification for such a substantial departure from historic procedure, a new

practice is to be initiated. I know my colleagues on the Public Works Committee possess great knowledge in this field, but I seriously question whether undertakings of this character and magnitude should be prosecuted without the regular procedure of hearing, review, evaluation, consideration, and approval of the entire Congress. The need for such urgency has not been established. Now that the Public Works Committee seems to have adopted a policy of introducing a river and harbor and flood control bill each year, there is no need for short-circuiting the established legislative process.

The language of this provision is also so broad as to encompass a scope of development far beyond anything heretofore considered to be within the purview of the Federal responsibility. "Any" water resource project would be eligible and its total cost could be unlimited. Only the "estimate" of its "Federal" first cost could not exceed \$10 million.

Third, Section 204 of title II would authorize the Dickey-Lincoln School project, St. John River in Maine. I emphasized earlier the importance to ourselves and future generations that our limited resources are used most efficiently and have suggested the steps required to be taken to guarantee that they are. I find repeated support for this approach in statements of executive branch officials. For example, Budget Director Charles L. Schultze said in an article in the Tax Foundation's Tax Review, dated August 1965:

The efficient allocation of resources in the Federal sector of the economy requires * * * a choice of the least-cost method of carrying on a given program—in other words, cost reduction.

Our major need is a much wider application of improved methods, techniques, and systems analysis to the definition of program objectives, the measurement of performance and the weighing of alternatives as the basis for decisions.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, which will cost some \$300 million or more when basic electric transmission lines are included is, for all intents and purposes, totally a Federal power project. Ninety-eight percent of the alleged benefits are from electric power. Nine-tenths of the remaining 2 percent of benefits are for area redevelopment, leaving only two-tenths of 1 percent, or \$40,000 for flood control, a traditional Corps of Engineer function. The project must be evaluated, therefore, almost solely on its power efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that our hardworking and conscientious colleagues on the Public Works Committee barely approved this project by a vote of 18 to 15. I am not a member of that distinguished committee but, having served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for some 16 years, I think my credentials are in order to speak with some knowledge on water resource development and hydroelectric dams. This St. John-Dickey-Lincoln School project, which has always been considered in connection with the discredited Passamaquoddy project, has been ramrodded this far through Congress by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Be-

cause of their experience, the members of the Public Works Committee may be pretty familiar with the Corps of Engineers, its activities, and its programs. But, because of my experience, I may know a little bit more about the Department of the Interior, its activities, and its programs, and let me assure each and every one of the Members here today that some of the proposals and activities of the Department of the Interior, as they relate to the development of Federal electric power, leave much to be desired.

Time and time again I have stood in the well of this House to tell my colleagues about the almost unbelievable attempts of the Department of the Interior to further the cause of public power. I have discussed the millions of dollars that are being lost annually by the power marketing agencies of the department. Despite this tremendous annual loss in every single one of its marketing agencies, Secretary Udall glibly tells the Public Works Committee—according to the transcript of the hearings before that group—that, of course, a new power administration would have to be created in New England to market the power from the Dickey-Lincoln School project. The Secretary also admitted under careful cross-examination that no attempt has yet been made by any official of his Department to discuss with potential customers in New England the possibilities of marketing this block of power. This should be a startling revelation about the slipshod way this project has been conceived, nurtured, and foisted on the Congress and the unsuspecting American public. It is not startling to me, however, because I have dealt with that agency too closely too long.

Mr. Chairman, even in the report of other Government agencies to the Secretary of the Interior on the combined St. John-Passamaquoddy project, some of them admitted that alternative methods of generation could and would produce electric power more cheaply in New England. In addition to the many admonitions and expressions of Government officials emphasizing how essential it is to select the best way of doing things, the need for comparing alternatives to show the relative economic efficiency of a project and available alternatives is set forth in the administration's statement of "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources"—Senate Document No. 97. Chapter V, paragraph C2, of that document states that comprehensive plans shall be formulated to include units and purposes which, among other things, satisfy the following criteria:

There is no more economical means, evaluated on a comparable basis, of accomplishing the same purpose or purposes which could be precluded from development if the plan were undertaken. This limitation refers only to those alternative possibilities that would be physically displaced or economically precluded from development if the project is undertaken.

The hearing record before the Public Works Committee clearly establishes that there are more economic alternatives. The Department of the Interior

reports on the project succinctly point out that there are more economical means than Dickey of producing power in the New England area. Such other means, however, are rejected because there is no Federal authority to undertake them. In other words, if the Federal Government cannot do it, it is not an acceptable alternative. Such specious reasoning not only makes a mockery of the comparability test, but also exposes the real objectives of the Interior Department—Federal power regardless of cost or economics.

Non-Federal interests have confirmed the findings of Interior that power can be produced more economically by nuclear energy and pumped storage, yet the pressures to authorize this uneconomic and inefficient proposed Federal development persist. It has not even been studied from the standpoint of securing the best development of the resources of the area.

This country cannot afford the luxury of building the Dickey-Lincoln School project, at least as presently conceived, merely to advance a philosophical and ideological ambition.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly discussed three major provisions of S. 2300, as reported to the House of Representatives, which involve fundamental policies of Government as well as enormous expenditures. There are other provisions in the bill of similar import. This body, if it is to act responsibly, must insist on a much more careful review of their implications and potentials before giving them its approval. It is pitiful that we are about to embark on some of these significant new ventures in such a casual way. The time for demonstration of interest, concern, and integrity is here. I hope we will capitalize on this opportunity to make sound decisions and to give statesmanlike direction to these matters because if we fail to do so—

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all our pitey nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all our tears wash out a word of it.

Mr. Chairman, the St. John project can and must be stricken from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that in his opinion the "noes" had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLARK and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 130.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct an inquiry to the committee, perhaps the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

I am concerned over the language which appears at page 46, line 24 of the bill, wherein it is stated in subparagraph (3) that "the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with

respect to improvements for fish and wildlife."

The House report accompanying the 1966 public works appropriation bill would prohibit certain purchases of land.

I quote from that report:

The committee has not approved the use of any funds for the purchase of land in fee for a swamp area or a wildlife refuge on the Yazoo Backwater project in Issaquena and Warren Counties.

I may say that the report accompanying the bill S. 2300 states that the Bureau of the Budget recommends the acquisition of land for fish and wildlife purposes in the Hillside floodway.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama this question. Is it intended that the language in the Senate bill, S. 2300, which I quoted a moment ago overrides or vitates or nullifies or repeals the prohibition contained in the report of the Committee on Appropriations from which I quoted a moment ago?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; this provision is not intended to override the prohibition the gentleman refers to. It has to do, instead, with the matter of cost sharing between Federal and non-Federal interests in land they would be authorized to purchase.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very grateful to the gentleman for clarifying that for me. I have one further question to ask the gentleman. Do I understand that future appropriations will have to be made before they could purchase land as purchased by this bill; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It certainly would require an appropriation in order to purchase this land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUNKEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUNKEL: Page 44, after line 21, insert the following: "The projects for Lazer Creek Reservoir, Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, and the project for Spewrell Bluff Reservoir authorized by the Act of December 30, 1963 (Public Law 88-253), are each modified to provide that a private power company may construct, own, operate, and maintain the hydroelectric power facilities at such reservoir if, within 2 years of the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Power Commission (1) licenses such company to do so in accordance with the Federal Power Act, and other applicable provisions of law, and (2) fixes, in accordance with section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act, the charges to be paid by the licensee for use of the dam so as to reimburse the Federal Government for project costs allocated to power during the period of the license. The operation and maintenance of such hydroelectric power facilities by a private power company shall be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered would provide for a joint Federal-private development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, by the Federal Government and a private power company. The joint de-

velopment of the Flint River Basin will promote a closer partnership between government and private enterprise and will result in a reduction in Federal expenditures for the development of that river.

In 1962, the Chief of Engineers recommended a comprehensive plan for development of the Flint River. This plan included construction of the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs in the headwaters for flood control, hydroelectric power generation, general recreation and fishing recreation, and two other projects, primarily for navigation, below Albany, Ga. The general plan was approved by Congress in 1963, but only the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir was authorized at that time.

The bill now being considered would authorize the other two headwater projects at Lazer Creek and Lower Auchumpkee Creek at an estimated Federal cost of \$88,653,000. The total estimated cost of these two projects and Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir is \$156,455,000, of which \$52 million, or one-third of the entire cost, is for construction of the hydroelectric power features.

The amendment which I have offered would provide that a private power company may construct, own, operate, and maintain the hydroelectric power facilities at each of these three reservoirs if, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this legislation, the Federal Power Commission licenses such company to do so in accordance with the Federal Power Act and other applicable provisions of law, and fixes, in accordance with section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act, the charges to be paid by the licensee for use of the dam so as to reimburse the Federal Government for project costs allocated to power during the period of the time of the license. The operation and maintenance of such hydroelectric power facilities by a private power company would be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Chairman, the Georgia Power Co. has made a firm offer in hearings before the committee to build, maintain, and operate powerhouses, and incidental facilities at the three dams under FPC license and in a manner satisfactory to the Corps of Engineers. The company would make annual payments which would fully repay the Federal Government for the project costs allocated to power.

Mr. Chairman, the present and immediately past Governors of Georgia have gone on record as favoring a joint project. The U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins, has recommended a joint venture. Local interests have given overwhelming support for joint development.

Joint construction of these three projects would result in a reduction in the Federal investment of \$52 million. Furthermore, independent auditors have estimated that joint projects at these three sites would generate over the 50-year period of the projects approximately \$41 million in additional Federal income

taxes. In addition, the company would pay the Government an estimated \$2.3 million annually for use of the dams.

The State, counties, and school districts would also substantially benefit. State income taxes attributable to the private portion of the projects over the 50-year period are estimated to be \$4.5 million. State and county ad valorem taxes are estimated at \$20.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, Federal construction of power generating facilities at the Spewrell Bluff, Lazer Creek, and Lower Auchumpkee Creek Dams and Reservoirs is not warranted. Private investment, in cooperation with the Federal Government, can accomplish the purposes with many additional public advantages.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that this amendment will be adopted.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KUNKEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would, of course, permit the private power development at these particular damsites, would it not? I speak of the three damsites in the authorization. Would not that action be consistent with the recommendation of the Resource Advisory Board of the Southeast River Basin of which Georgia is a participant? They have recommended that that be done on a partnership basis with private power companies putting in the facilities needed for power development and the Federal Government putting in the facilities needed for the necessary rivers, harbors, and flood control development. Is that not correct?

Mr. KUNKEL. That is correct.

Most importantly, it would enable the river development to go right along as planned.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] for a variety of reasons, foremost among which is that if there is any sphere of activity in this Nation where the Federal Government has an undisputed right to participate in a full development, if it so desires, it is in the development, construction, and operation of multiple-purpose river development projects. This is exactly the type of project involved here, in a three-dam complex, each of which is a multiple-purpose dam of which hydroelectric power generation is one phase, navigation is another phase, flood control is another, and recreation is an additional phase.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the distinguished gentleman. It seems to me it would be a tragedy in the development of these resources if we only partially developed them. If power, flood control,

and recreation are all justified, why not develop them so that their full potential can be realized?

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments and for his contribution.

This project is one which is an investment in the future. It is an investment in the future development of this particular area just as it is an investment in the development of the United States of America.

This is a full payout project. The benefit-to-cost ratio exceeds unity. The benefit-to-cost ratio on the 3-dam complex stands at better than 1.3 to 1, which means for every dollar invested \$1.30 will be paid back in benefits.

We feel that this is a measure which has long been pending in the Congress of the United States, one to which the House Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Public Works have given serious study over the years.

I heartily subscribe to this development, and I endorse the language of the committee bill, which provides for full Federal development of the Flint River.

The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would do more than affect the projects which are contained in this bill. It would have the effect of deauthorizing a project which was authorized in December of 1963.

I urge the rejection of the amendment and the passage of S. 2300 including the language of the Committee on Public Works, which provides for full Federal development on this project which is very important to our State and our Nation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have previously testified before the Committee on Public Works and spoken in general debate on this bill, and I am wholeheartedly in favor of the full development of the Flint River.

The question raised by this amendment, however, is not whether the Flint River shall be developed, but how it can best be developed.

Under this amendment, private power would be given permission to participate in the development of the great Flint River.

Although I enthusiastically support this amendment, I have hesitated to speak in its behalf, because I have wanted to assure myself that I am representing all of my constituents and not just representing one particular company. I say this because for the last few years, and up until the time I was elected to this Congress, I served as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Georgia Power Co., and this is the private power company which serves this area, the company that could be affected by this amendment.

On further reflection, however, I have felt that I should speak on this amendment for a number of reasons. First, although my service on the power company board might tend to influence my judgment, this same service has certainly

given me firsthand knowledge of the facts in this case.

Second and more important to me, millions of dollars of tax money for my constituents and yours will go into this project. Thus I feel that I have an obligation to them and to all of the citizens of this country to try to save that tax money.

The Georgia Power Co. has had a long-standing interest in all Georgia rivers and specifically in the Flint River. As early as 1909 the company began to purchase land and flood rights at the sites of the very dams mentioned in this amendment. Throughout the years the Georgia Power Co. has built 17 separate dams to complement its steam generation plants with hydroelectric peaking capacity. The company has always been ready to build additional dams as this peaking power capacity was needed. In 1961 the company requested a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission to survey the Flint River in the hope of being granted permission for a private development of the river at no expense to the taxpayer. Unfortunately, this request was turned down by the Commission because the Corps of Engineers was studying the project. Now the Georgia Power Co. has made a firm offer to build, maintain, and operate the powerhouses on the Flint River. It is estimated that this will save the taxpayers a minimum of \$52 million. It was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that additional payments in addition to that will save another \$181 million over a 150-year period.

I agree with the majority leader that it would be a tragedy if this river were not fully developed, but it can be by the power company and the Government in partnership.

The Governor of Georgia, Mr. Sanders, favors the joint participation by private power in this development. The immediate past governor of Georgia, Mr. Vandiver, favored this development. The Georgia Waterways Commission, which is the official agency of the State of Georgia charged with the development of its rivers, favors it. The U.S. Study Commission, on the southeast river basins, rendered a comprehensive report in favor of joint development. Many mayors, councils, county commissions, and groups in the Flint River area have gone on record in favor of joint development. They are particularly interested in the local ad valorem taxes that would be developed by private power development and ownership of these projects.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not require a single thing. It just gives the private power company the chance to bid and prove its case. If they can prove their case to the Federal Power Commission, then they have an opportunity to participate.

Mr. Vinson, when he offered a similar proposal in the House, had language that would make private development mandatory. This is merely permissive for private power to participate.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for all of us who are for saving the taxpayers' money and for free enterprise to stand

up. The time is now, and I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The amount of Federal taxpayer money involved in this amendment is \$52 million. Is that correct?

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is the estimate. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. This is the opportunity for those who are worried about the cost of this Government, which is going up constantly, particularly with the defense effort needed now, to save \$52 million with this one amendment and let private enterprise do what they can admittedly do and what the people in Georgia say should be done on this project. This is the time for them to act.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That is correct. This will save \$52 million at this time and throughout all the years of taxpaying will save much more. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has made an outstanding contribution to this debate and I congratulate him.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into a detailed study of the Flint River project. We were thoroughly convinced in the Committee on Public Works that it would be in the best interests of all concerned to develop this river as a Federal project. In this particular area of Georgia the rivers run red with the soils of the surrounding hillsides. We expect to take this development further down the river in years to come and do not want to be involved in any long-term agreements with private power companies which might in some way hamper future development.

I urge that we support the committee and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" had it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KUNKEL and Mr. BLATNIK.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 87, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 78, line 1:

TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to

plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Navigation

Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,500,000;

Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,900,000;

Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,000;

New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,581,000;

New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$44,852,000;

Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,090,000;

Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$323,000;

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,095,000;

Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$25,600,000;

Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,510,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of \$40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of \$60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,484,000;

Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,104,000;

Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,093,000;

East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,151,000;

Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$625,000;

Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$262,000;

Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,690,000;

Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$237,000;

Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$437,000;

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$664,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,840,000;

Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$235,000.

The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 490) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut number 1. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut number 1, but for this modification.

West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$544,000;

Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$96,000;

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$25,000,000. In view of the willingness of the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a deep-draft public harbor in that vicinity, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such a harbor according to a design agreed upon by the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana, subject to the following conditions: (1) The amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the State of Indiana, and approved by the President; (2) such amount shall not exceed the cost to the United States of constructing an equivalent Federal harbor at the same site; (3) prior to the time that the monetary contribution, or any part thereof, is made available to the State of Indiana the Secretary of the Army and the State of Indiana shall have entered into an agreement providing for the operation of the harbor essentially as it would be operated by the Secretary of the Army had it been constructed as a Federal harbor; (4) no fees or tolls shall be charged for entrance to the outer harbor; (5) any other fees or charges collected by the State of Indiana shall not be used to cover any part of the contribution made by the Federal Government under this Act; (6) any funds appropriated under this authorization shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army and made available to the State of Indiana over the period of construction in proportion to the proposed annual expenditures of the State for construction of the outer harbor; and (7) at least sixty days prior

to the date on which the Secretary of the Army makes available to the State of Indiana the initial installment of the monetary contribution authorized by this Act, he shall submit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives a letter report setting forth the basis for his determination under clause (1) above. Unless construction of the harbor is initiated within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the authority for the monetary contribution contained in this paragraph shall expire. Neither this paragraph nor the construction authorized by this paragraph shall adversely affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana dunes as a national lakeshore.

Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,254,000;

Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$470,000;

Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized \$83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,980,000;

Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$853,000;

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,360,000;

Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$696,000;

Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,308,000;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,000,000;

Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,737,000;

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$680,000;

Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$9,928,000;

Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,291,000;

Beach erosion

Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$340,000;

Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$82,000;

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$319,000;

Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,266,000;

Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;

Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$392,000;

Haleiva Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$572,000;

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,490,000.

Sec. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of waterhyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasian water-milfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of \$5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds."

Sec. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

Sec. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extend-

ing the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed \$75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

Lake Dauterive and Charenton Floodgate, Louisiana.

Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

Manchester Harbor, Washington.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

Calumet River, Illinois.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Michigan (beach erosion).

Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

Sec. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins "James River, Virginia:" in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out "after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date".

Sec. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$22,000".

Sec. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

Sec. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

Sec. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary

of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States."

Sec. 310. (a) (1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out "\$200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out "\$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000", and (2) by striking out "\$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

Sec. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control,

control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$8,500,000 to carry out this section.

Sec. 313. (a) The Act approved December 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 846), authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, is hereby revived and reenacted. This section (including the amendments made by this section) shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not

previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been therefore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"(b) Such bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denominations whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and in-

terest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest."

(d) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

Sec. 314. The Act entitled "An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois", approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669), as amended by the Act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59), is amended by inserting immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"Sec. 15. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this section shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this section."

Sec. 315. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

Sec. 316. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

Sec. 317. Title III of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1965".

Mr. CRAMER (interrupting reading of title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the minority, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. I have two survey resolutions which were inadvertently left out of the bill and I would like to have them read and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the gentleman has cleared these two amendments with this side, No. 1; and, second, the gentleman has stated

his reason for offering them at this time is because they were inadvertently omitted when survey resolutions were considered in the committee and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, on what page does title 3 start?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 78 and goes to the end of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, an amendment to page 61 is now not in order through unanimous consent; is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLATNIK

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: Page 90, after line 6, insert the following: "Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts."

Page 91, after line 22, insert the following: "Marquette County, Michigan."

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: Page 90, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through and including line 3 on page 91.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out on page 90 of the printed bill a section that sets up a study for de-icing the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, this study costs but a mere \$75,000, and I feel a little bit hesitant to stand before you and plead economy, but only to save \$75,000.

Let me tell you something about this amendment of mine, and this particular project of somebody's.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman he does not have to apologize as far as this gentleman is concerned for standing in the well and offering this proposal for the simple reason we had it up in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill 3 years ago, and in a separate bill. It was never acted on. The project is so asinine in itself that a study is not justified even if it cost only \$5,000. It makes this House ridiculous to consider such a project.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman is correct. Two years ago this study passed the Senate and the Public Works Committee, but it never got any further. Two years ago they thought they could make this study for \$50,000. Now they have come back with it, and it has gone to \$75,000. Perhaps I should not try to kill it, because if it comes back 2 years

from now it may be up to \$100,000. There was little or no evidence in favor of it. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with me. There is no evidence that there was any practical way of de-icing the Great Lakes. Here you are taking \$75,000 of the taxpayers' money to study nothing. They have what they call a system of bubbling by putting bubbles into water and they can keep small areas of water free of ice, areas around a dredge, for instance, but can anybody in their right mind conceive of a situation where we are going to have the Great Lakes turned into one gigantic bubble bath?

This just makes no sense at all.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. I can conceive what the gentleman speaks of, not as a foolish gesture, but as a reality. I can envision water being kept in an uniced state.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yielded for a question. The gentleman should get his own time.

Mr. RONCALIO. The gentleman asked a question, and I answered it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield no further.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman asked me a moment ago on what page this occurred. It is page 214, and if the gentleman would like to have this section I will give it to him.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Would the gentleman agree to put his amendment on ice for the time being?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think that is where my amendment will go, but I want to be sure that the RECORD shows a description of the project and how at least I feel about it. It appears on page 236 of the majority report, but it is not described, it is not even referred to. You have to read the bill to find it. On page 215 of the printed record, part 1, and I inserted in that part of the record of our hearings the minority views in which I expressed my views 2 years ago. Other than that the hearings have been quiet on this subject. I also inserted my views on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 31, 1965—page 22415—it is not necessary to discuss them again in detail here. As I say, this is a small matter, but I hope that the chairman of the committee will agree to this amendment.

I urge the House to adopt my amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the only statement which had any semblance of reality, logic or commonsense that the gentleman made was the fact that \$75,000 in a \$2 billion public works authorization is not very much money. From then on he had just sheer fantasy.

In this bill we have over \$5 million for an authorization for weed control. Here

is the largest body of fresh water on this planet through which runs the longest inland waterway on this planet. We ask for an amount of money, \$75,000, merely to review scientific information, processes and procedures that already exist and to select which one of them shows some promise of protecting ports from ice, which may extend the navigation season for whatever amount of time it may be extendable. We already have this enormous investment on the part of the Government in the channels and harbors. The States and municipalities have investment in terminal and harbor facilities and private industry has their investment in boats and shipping equipment and loading and unloading facilities and so forth and so on. A lake can be 95 percent open but if ice jams the Sault Saint Marie Locks or if it jams up the Welland Canal, then all intercontinental transoceanic traffic is stopped.

So I will read very quickly here the problem of icing conditions in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway have remained in the status quo for so long and only limited information of a scientific nature is available on specific ice formation and deicing problems. Extending the navigation season can best be accomplished by concentrating these investigations under proper conditions in order to improve the accuracy of the forecast as well as evaluate ice control methods which can be used to aid in the opening of navigation.

This approach offers the best chance of success and can provide major economic benefits. Any means of improving the accuracy of the forecast for the opening of navigation on various routes can save U.S. shippers significant sums of money which are now lost because fully crewed ships have to wait out the actual opening and the Corps of Engineers recognizes the feasibility of the study, the objectives of which are to investigate the practicability and means and economic justification for extending the shipping season.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the retention of this most modest amount of money for this purpose.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about a project in this bill in the State of Iowa which is to be found, I think, on page 61 of the bill. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] can tell us something about that. I would like to vote intelligently on this bill. I know he normally opposes all of these so-called pork-barrel projects and I wonder if the gentleman can conscientiously vote for this bill with this project in it?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the gentleman from Iowa can enlighten the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Do not say that it is not easy because that is not like the gentleman. But go ahead.

Mr. GROSS. I would not say it is easy to enlighten the gentleman from Ohio. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. HAYS. Well there is \$14 million here and the gentleman is a great watchdog of the Treasury, and I just wonder

if the taxpayers can afford to spend \$14 million out there which I understand \$3 million of which is for urban renewal which the gentleman has not been known to favor heretofore.

I hope I have not rendered the gentleman speechless.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio is not now expressing concern about \$14 million, is he—with his record of spending in the Congress?

Mr. HAYS. I am a big spender, but then you know I want to be consistent. I suppose I ought to be for this but the gentleman from Iowa is always against spending, especially for urban renewal, and I just wonder if it makes any difference if the urban renewal is in Ohio or in Iowa—or in my district or in his district?

Mr. GROSS. I was not aware that the gentleman from Iowa was against all spending. There is in the bill a project for a district adjoining the Third District of Iowa and which is a part of the \$14 million. The gentleman might have brought the Democrat Member from Iowa into this discussion, and asked him to help to justify the project.

Mr. HAYS. I never thought the day would come when a question about money would render the gentleman from Iowa speechless or near speechless. Speak up if you can, my time is running out.

Mr. GROSS. I am perfectly able to talk. The gentleman from Ohio could make quite a downpayment on the \$14 million if he would forgo a few of the junkets around the world that he takes.

Mr. HAYS. Though I told the gentleman from Iowa the story once before, since there are many new Members here, I shall tell the story again.

There were two Quakers who many years ago lived in the little town I came from. One of them liked to travel; the other did not.

One time the one friend who liked to travel came back from an around-the-world trip, and his fellow churchman met him in the town square and said, "Friend John, does not thee know that a rolling stone gathers no moss?"

The other replied, "Thee may be right, friend Asa; but it gets a lot of polish."

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department personnel and foreign operations I need all the knowledge I can get. I recommend some foreign travel for the gentleman from Iowa. It not only gives polish; it helps cure parochialism.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am concerned with a project that appears on page 83 of the bill, the so-called Burns Waterway harbor project.

I am concerned that this project should not represent the latest triumph of the bulldozer in eliminating a great naturally beautiful area of our country. I am concerned that approval of this project should not mean the death of the proposal to make the sand dunes of Indiana a beautiful national park.

The Burns Harbor development has been the center of a controversy for years between those who favor conservation and those who want industrial development of the area. Those of us who favor conservation do not oppose industrial development; in fact, we are not opposed to the project as such. But what we are fearful of is that approval of this project may result in killing the establishment of the dunes as a national park.

This was certainly not the intent of the compromise that resulted from a White House study of the area in 1963. President Kennedy personally took an interest in the area and instructed the Bureau of the Budget to look into the possibilities for both the industrial and recreational developments. The resulting compromise was confirmed in a letter dated 2 years ago this week, September 24, 1963, from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of the Army. The letter stated:

It is the President's wish to see a deep-draft harbor for Indiana made a reality, while at the same time preserving as much as possible of the priceless heritage of the Indiana Dunes for future generations.

The key words are "at the same time." This position has been affirmed and amplified on numerous occasions. Mr. Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference for the Bureau of the Budget, wrote in a letter to Senator HENRY JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on February 8 of this year:

The Bureau of the Budget regards both the Burns Harbor and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore proposals as integral elements for a balanced development of the area.

On the same day, President Johnson stated his firm support for the national lakeshore in his message on natural beauty.

Up to the present time both proposals have gone forward concurrently. In fact, the bill that was passed by the Senate provided that no funds should be expended for the development of this harbor unless there should have been established a national park for the sand dunes of Indiana.

Now, apparently that is no longer the case.

Some say it may come with ill grace for a Member of Congress from the State of Illinois to take the floor to comment upon an area in Indiana. But, Mr. Chairman, many of my people in the city of Chicago use the Indiana sand dunes. It is one of the great remaining natural facilities in the entire country. The people of the entire Midwest are aware of this. They relish its beauty. It is a unique place and should be given appropriate recognition to preserve its beauties. It ranks in principle with Yellowstone, Glacier, and other national parks as natural retreats or sanctuaries, serving as centers of attraction for the people not only of Indiana but of the entire country. The sand dunes of Indiana deserve such recognition so that they belong to all the people of our country.

The lakeshore proposal accomplishes that which is truly a rarity in the United

States today. It puts a park where people are. There are today nearly 10 million people residing within 100 miles of the proposed 11,292-acre park. This is a park that would have that incomparable advantage of accessibility. The people of Chicago are included in that 100-mile radius. In Chicago we are very mindful of the beauty of the Indiana dunes and we are concerned for their preservation. As Carl Sandburg has written:

The Dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity; once lost the loss would be irrevocable.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concluded:

Nowhere on the Great Lakes are water, waterfront, and hinterland more favorably combined for recreational use of millions.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. First, let me say that the gentleman's concern for the Indiana Dunes Park could be no less than my own, but I am equally concerned that Indiana have its port. The language which Members will find in the bill before us is language which I have included in H.R. 50 a bill which I introduced to provide for the port.

Also pending before the House is a bill which I introduced on the same day, H.R. 51, to provide for a National Dunes Lakeshore in Indiana on Lake Michigan.

As the gentleman knows, there has been an agreement between the proponents of the park and the proponents of the port which is in general, accepted by both sides.

I am happy to inform the gentleman that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs only yesterday announced that hearings will be held on the proposal for the Indiana Dunes Park. These hearings will be held October 2 and 3. They will be held in Indiana. They will be followed by further hearings in Washington, D.C., early next year.

I certainly urge the gentleman to continue his support of this very worthwhile project, and I hope he shares my concern that both the port and the park may go forward at the same time and that we may be able to say there will be a total development of the northern area of Indiana involved.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am pleased to know that he, too, supports the development of the dunes and to learn of his efforts to develop the dunes as a national park. I take it from what the gentleman said that if he will do his best to expedite passage of his bill making the dunes a national park. The gentleman from Indiana favors concurrent development of both projects. I agree with that.

I also favor concurrent development. That is why I am concerned that the development authorized in this bill of the Burns Harbor project shall not impede or prevent the development of the dunes

as a national park. I am pleased, too, with assurances given me by members of the committee that they favor establishing the dunes as a national park and that this project will not interfere with the park.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. I had hoped that the gentleman would say that which he did. I am grateful to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that hearings will proceed expeditiously on the establishment of the National Park for the Sand Dunes of Indiana.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of this legislation and I desire to commend the great Committee on Public Works for the fine work which has been done in bringing this bill to the House.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am reluctant to take more time, but since there will be no further amendments and probably no other discussion, I believe it fitting and proper, as well as justifiable, to say a word or two in behalf of our colleague, our respected and beloved friend, Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, for the tremendous amount of work he has put in on this bill.

Certainly the major share dollarwise, if that can be considered a measure—for what it is worth—has come under his jurisdiction. Two-thirds or three-fourths of this omnibus bill comes under the flood control subcommittee, of which he is chairman, the chairmanship of which he assumed for the first time in this session of the Congress.

Far above that, and far more important, is his dedication to the basic principles of conservation and the utilization and preservation of our resources wherever they may be in this great country.

Equally important is his personal interest in every municipality, every hamlet and city and rural area represented by any Member of the House. He devotes his time to the problems of each, knowing that the particular area involved for that Congressman is the most important problem.

I wish to pay this tribute to him. I know I speak for a host of Members on both sides of the aisle in paying respects for a job done far beyond the call of duty in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in my opening remarks I complimented the two gentlemen who put this rivers and harbors and flood control bill together [Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. JONES of Alabama].

I might say I do not know of any two men who worked harder to bring a bill before the House to extend the economy of this country than these two gentle-

men. The greatest part of this bill is for the protection of lives and property. Certainly the history of rivers and harbors and flood control projects that have been built has proven that they have saved not only billions of dollars but many, many lives.

This bill that is before the House today is one of the best bills that has ever come before this House from the Committees on Public Works. It is an attempt to do the job necessary not only for the present but for many years to come.

I would like to pay tribute, also, to the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee who worked so hard and so diligently and put in so many hours not only during the day but far into the night in order to bring out this legislation. I would like to say to this House that this is an example of a great team working under the leadership of great subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman relating to our committee working its will and doing its best.

I might add an addendum—when given the opportunity to do so. In past years we have had omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bills where Democrats and Republicans, those on both sides of the aisle, stood shoulder to shoulder as far as leadership is concerned in trying to keep out of the bill projects that were admittedly bad, largely involving public versus private power and which should not be approved. Some of the most heated debate and divisions in this House have been on that one issue. I hope a similar decision will be made here. I understand a demand for a separate vote will be made on the Clark amendment. I hope this House will sustain the Clark amendment, which does what should be done on the Passamaquoddy-St. John project today to make a study and bring a report back to Congress next year. I say that because this project has been at no time studied separately. This is the proper procedure that should be followed in this case and which our committee and this House has constantly sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other observation. I say this in all sincerity. I think it is most unfortunate that our committee was not given an equal opportunity to make its own decision and come up with a consensus on highway beautification. It was possible to do so and, as a matter of fact, the groundwork for it was laid 2 weekends ago when a consensus committee print was before the committee and so that we could come up with a consensus bill that would do the job relating to highway beautification but without the result of putting small business people who necessarily serve the highway traveling public and whose businesses are not located on the highways out of business.

I am talking about the little hotel and restaurant operators and the operators of recreational centers available to the traveling public in America. We need a bill to do the job but that would not put them out of business, which this

proposal would do which was demanded by the White House and in effect reported by our committee. This proposal would have the effect of getting the Federal Government into zoning questions which are presently within the jurisdiction of local areas and cities. For the first time a demand was made by the White House on Wednesday of last week which was a demand for a proposal giving the Secretary power to set standards in areas zoned industrial and commercial which was not even included by the administration in its initial bill, and it was not proposed prior to that and thus subject to our hearings or subject to discussion in our hearings. I say to you all of us want to beautify highways but not at the expense of unduly putting people out of business and making depressed business in our country that are operated by people who are legitimately trying to serve the traveling public. We also do not want the traveling public denied the necessary information, services, and facilities for their food, shelter, repairs, and gasoline for automobiles, and information as to the whereabouts of recreational facilities which will be denied to them, in my opinion, under the bill as drafted.

I sincerely hope when that bill gets to the floor of the House we will be able to get proper and unhampered consideration of it.

I am sorry that similar action was not possible in the Public Works Committee on the beautification bill as on this omnibus public works bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that in the morning paper in Washington a grave injustice was done to one of our colleagues from the State of Texas and a grave injustice was done to me in quoting me as having made a personal reference to the gentleman from Texas, one which I did not make. I made no remarks that were anywhere close to that to which reference was made. I am sure the gentleman from Texas was present at all times on the floor. I am sure he is personally aware that I did not and would not make any comment of that kind.

I may thoroughly disagree with the gentleman with respect to a particular project in which he is very much interested, but I hope the day never comes when I shall have to resort to tactics of that kind in debate in this House of Representatives.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my very sincere and earnest gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for the comment he has just made and assure him that at no time did I believe that he had said that which was recorded in the paper this morning. I assumed that it was an error. And even if the gentleman had said such a thing, he would still be my friend.

In any event, I did not believe that he had said it and I am very grateful

to him for the opportunity which he has graciously afforded me to make this statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas not only did I make no such comment publicly on this floor, or in any other place, but made no such comment privately at any time, or in any place.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300, a bill that has much significance in the 14th District of New Jersey which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

Much has been said on the floor today about "megalopolis" the name which we have coined for that great city which shall soon reach from Norfolk, Va., to Portland, Maine.

We have a great interest in megalopolis in northern New Jersey because we stand at the midpoint of this gigantic urban metropolis.

It is superfluous, Mr. Chairman, for me to dwell upon our recent water shortage which has posed a tremendous threat to our economic and physical well-being in the Northeastern United States.

Title I of this bill will set up a plan for a system of reservoirs to serve the Northeastern United States.

And, Mr. Chairman, the need for this comprehensive planning has been so well dramatized that I shall not waste the time of this House in explaining the need for a more adequate water supply in the Northeast. Every Member, whether he is from New Jersey or New York or California or Oregon, knows only too well the threat that another year of drought will pose to the northeastern part of the United States. If for no other reason than this, I would support this worthy bill.

I have said many times on the floor of the House that we are one nation. Economic sickness in one part of the United States means economic sickness in all parts of the Nation. It is for this reason that I supported the Appalachia program. I know in my heart that what is good for Kentucky and Tennessee is inevitably good for Hudson County, N.J. If the New York-New Jersey area is to suffer because of a water shortage, all parts of America in turn will feel the effects of our decline.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason, I urge all Members to support this much needed legislation.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, while approving the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill as a whole, I particularly approve that portion of the bill as contained on pages 215-217 of the report of the Committee on Public Works, dealing with the Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Mass. Since the conclusion of World War II tankers and bulk cargo carriers have been built much bigger, and these larger ships require deeper draft and old channel depths that at one time could accommodate all types of ships can no longer accommodate the new type vessels. Passage of this legislation will vitally affect the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth in my 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts. The Town

River is a tributary waterway of the port of Boston and lies entirely within the limits of the city of Quincy. The Town River is a tidal river, approximately 2 miles in length and empties into the Weymouth Fore River at Quincy Point. This river is chiefly used for transportation of petroleum products and the annual tonnage traffic increases each year. The Quincy Oil Co. is located about 1½ miles from the mouth of the river and has a 30 million gallon oil terminal, receiving over 50 tankers a year.

Present depths of the Town River will not accommodate the large tankers now in use and necessitates the use of barges to transport the fuel to the terminal from the tankers. Increasing the depth to 35 feet and widening the river will provide adequate channel depths and widths for larger ships to carry the prospective commerce on the waterway as well as the existing commerce.

Other oil companies as well as ship repair yards and the Quincy Electric Co. are located on the waterway in question. The latter will require the use of deep-draft traffic for receipt of fuel in line with construction of a new generating plant.

The Weymouth-Fore River is the location of the General Dynamics/Electric Boat Division Quincy yard which is one of the largest and most complete ship-building plants on the Atlantic coast. It is equipped with 12 launching ways and 3 mooring basins.

Also on this river is the Boston Edison Co.'s Edgar Station and the Cities Service Oil Co.

The project has an estimated Federal cost of \$12.5 million and local participation of \$1.5 million. The benefit from the completion of this project will be felt by these concerns and assist in the population, industrial, and commercial growth of the complete south shore area of which Quincy and Weymouth play a leading role.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I have always given my support to public works projects which protect and improve the vital natural resources of this country. While it may be argued that some of these measures are extravagant and not needed, on the whole the overwhelming majority of these projects have been carefully studied by the Committee on Public Works and have received their stamp of approval as worthwhile projects for the expenditure of taxpayers' money. I concur in this conclusion. During debate on the bill, I supported amendments which would delete or cut those projects which were wasteful or questionable.

The people of my District are hopeful that two of our vital projects will get the go-ahead in next year's public works authorization and appropriation bills. The Kokosing project has already been authorized and funds have been advanced for initial work. We need to allocate the necessary funds for this vital project so the people of Knox County and Mount Vernon, Ohio, will be afforded the flood control protection they so badly need.

In Licking County, the Corps of Engineers currently has a project which is

still under study. They are nearing completion and we certainly hope that it will be authorized as soon as possible so this work can proceed. This, too, is a flood control project and vital to the growth of Newark and Licking County. No work of my office has been more intensive or more rewarding than my efforts on these two projects.

Both of these areas have been hit by disastrous floods which caused many millions of dollars worth of damage. In consulting with the members of the committee, I have found widespread support for the Licking project when it clears the survey stage. Inasmuch as the Licking project has not proceeded beyond the survey stage, nothing can be done here today. My constituents are patient people and yet they all feel as I do that the time for action is now. I hope that the Corps of Engineers will give us the final OK on the Licking project and the Bureau of the Budget will include an adequate appropriation for the Kokosing project in their 1967 requests. In this way, we can take a positive step forward.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2300 and particularly in support of the projects on the Neuse River Basin: The Falls Dam and Reservoir and the project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity.

Last fall following unusually heavy rainfall in the upper Neuse Basin, I flew by helicopter over the Neuse in Wayne and Lenoir Counties in the vicinity of Goldsboro and Seven Springs, N.C., and the flood damage was almost indescribable. It was obvious that it came from the upper reaches of the river, and the Wilmington district office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reported that had the Falls Dam been constructed at that time, the great majority of the damage would have been prevented.

Cost-benefit ratios as shown in reports of the Corps of Engineers are cold statistics and are hard to visualize in terms of evacuated homes with water standing in them several feet deep, of isolated families clustered outside their houses completely surrounded by water looking up and waving at a helicopter; or hundreds of acres of unharvested corn under water; flooded pastures with cattle in tight little knots on a high spot, or a gigantic industrial complex like the Carolina Power & Light Co. steam generation plant at Quaker Neck with the waters submerging its coal piles and lapping ominously around the footings of the generator itself.

The cost-benefit ratio for the Falls Dam project is a favorable one, but I am confident that there is not a Member of this body who, if he had seen what I saw along the Neuse Basin in the Goldsboro-Seven Springs vicinity last fall, would not only agree that the project is justified, but would be an enthusiastic supporter of it.

The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and vicinity is a different type of proposal and provides for the construction of a dam with a break in the center. It would retard and spread out the flow of tidal waters forced upriver by heavy hurricane tides and winds. It is a relatively new concept and

I am advised that before a request is made for funding of construction of the project, the Corps of Engineers will first request funds for a model study to prove completely the feasibility of the construction.

Certainly the authorization of the project to the end that the model study can be funded is justified. As these remarks are being made, interests along the gulf coast are still trying to evaluate the damage caused by Hurricane Betsy and Hurricane Carol is meandering about in the Caribbean trying to make up her mind where to go.

In recent years, it has not been a question of whether New Bern and vicinity would be hit by hurricane winds and tides, but rather a question of when.

Both of these projects are worthy of being included in this bill.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, I note with some degree of curiosity that this bill—which I have often heard described as pork barrel legislation—authorizes a total appropriation of \$4 million for the State of Michigan, which has more coastline, more harbors, and handles as much shipping as any State in the Union. At the same time, it authorizes more than six times as much for the construction of one harbor in Indiana, at Burns ditch, which will be of immediate benefit to one steel company. If steel were used to make pork barrels, I could understand how the legislation got its name.

I notice, too, that Texas will receive about 26 times as much as Michigan, three-quarters of which is a downpayment on developing a port for the city of Fort Worth. Both Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, in my district, are on an equally navigable river, and for less money we might well be able to make an ocean port—accessible through the Great Lakes—for them. And yet this obviously worthwhile proposal was not even considered.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this type of public works bill may be of value when our Nation is not on the verge of inflation. Pump priming may have its virtues when the pump is dry. But today I feel we may need to be more concerned that the well will go dry, particularly in view of the impending increases in our defense appropriations. I cannot consider the bill, as a whole, timely nor a good investment of our national funds. So I vote against it. These programs would be well curtailed and delayed.

Should the Federal Government indeed have an excess \$1.9 billion setting around, I would prefer it be given to the States on a per capita basis, in the nature of a tax sharing scheme.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, over the years I think I have a pretty good record in support of flood control and the conservation of soil and water resources. I know of nothing more necessary and no responsibility greater than to do the things we know we must to preserve these God-given resources for the benefit of the future.

It is now being realized in other parts of the country where water has been plentiful that the problem of water shortage and water quality can be as important as survival itself. We from the

more arid areas have long been aware of the problem because we have learned it from hard experience.

It is trite to say that water is essential to all other things, and to neglect doing those things which we must is to shirk a responsibility and close our eyes to the progress and development of our country.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, in support of the record I have for projects which have these things as their goal and purpose. There are many good projects in this bill. There are some of highly doubtful merit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I face a very difficult choice involving several big items included in the measure before us. First, it seems to me the project on the St. John River in Maine is neither justified nor needed. You have heard the debate and the reasons for the weakness of this proposal. Other things aside, it just does not seem right to me that a \$227 million project should not have some local contribution, and this has none.

Then, Mr. Chairman, of course, even more difficult is to oppose any part or feature of a great project in my own State of Texas. Without hesitancy, I would vote for flood control, municipal water, recreation or any of the other benefits coming from the development of the Trinity River, but I cannot, in judgment and conscience, support the canalization of the Trinity River to make it navigable from the gulf to Fort Worth, Tex.

I am well aware of the contention of my colleagues that this feature will be further studied and that it will be necessary to return to the Congress for funds to carry out this part of the proposal. I do not see it this way at all, and there is no doubt in my mind that the authorization contained in this bill is final and obligatory to undertake this development, which is really undefined in many respects, and especially as to cost.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that it affords me no pleasure at all to oppose my respected and esteemed colleagues who are convinced of the worthiness of this project, but I have long been committed against the navigational aspect of the Trinity River. For the reasons of pure economics, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and the lack of feasibility, I simply must oppose this feature of it. Otherwise I enthusiastically support the proposition.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me say that I support S. 2300, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, with the exception of the three projects set forth in the supplemental views of which I am a coauthor. Generally speaking, this legislation is good legislation and I would hope that we could correct those phases of the legislation with which I disagree. However, at this time I want to make a few remarks concerning the Trinity River project.

I think it is well that I do so because the subcommittee on which I have the honor of serving as ranking minority member, recommended this project to the full committee. I am frank to admit that, initially, I had serious misgivings

about this project, particularly in view of the position of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army, however, I feel that we have considerably improved that phase of the legislation by writing into the bill and in the committee report, provisions whereby there will be an appropriate restudy based on current criteria and, in addition thereto, there will be an opportunity for this Congress, as well as the Public Works Committee, to review that project at such time as later monetary authorizations are necessary.

I want to pay particular tribute here, Mr. Chairman, to the work of the gentleman from Texas, Congressman RAY ROBERTS, who was quite instrumental, not only in seeing that this project was approved by both the subcommittee and full committee of the House Public Works Committee, but whose persuasive and logical arguments in behalf of this project convinced me that, in the long run, the project will be in the best interest of our Nation.

During my service on the House Committee on Public Works, I have found that Congressman ROBERTS has been one of the most dedicated, diligent and effective members serving thereon. He not only has been a strong supporter of the Trinity River project and one of the principal reasons why the committee approved it, but he has been equally an effective spokesman for navigational development on the Red and Sabine Rivers in Texas.

While these particular projects have not, as yet, been submitted to the committee, I feel sure that, as a result of his diligent efforts in their behalf, they will soon appear in an omnibus bill and I, again, want to commend Congressman ROBERTS for, not only his tremendous and effective efforts in behalf of the Trinity River project, but in behalf of all of his work on our committee. He truly represents his district ably and well.

And, at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the House's attention to the extremely effective efforts of the distinguished Senator from Texas, JOHN G. TOWER, in behalf of this project.

Senator Tower has conferred with me and other members of the committee on numerous occasions, strongly urging support of this project and his logical, persuasive and aggressive arguments in behalf of this project to me and to others as well, I am sure, contributed immensely to the position of the Public Works Committee in favoring the authorization of the Trinity River project.

The Trinity River project has long been a bipartisan project supported by most Texans of all political persuasions, who are interested in the development of the entire Trinity River watershed. This was summed up in a statement presented to the House Public Works Committee by Senator JOHN TOWER. In recognizing the contributions made toward the Trinity River project by Texans of all political and economic persuasions, the Senator said:

Many men have dreamed and worked for many years to make the Trinity River project a reality.

I want the House Public Works Committee to know that I share that dream and support efforts aimed at seeing it become a reality.

As a citizen of our State, and as a representative of our people in the National Congress, I want to ask the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives to look with favor on the entire Trinity River project.

I shall not here attempt to argue the merits of the Trinity River project. Others have done this ably and well over the years. The technical and economic considerations have been explored fully by persons well-trained and qualified for their tasks. I merely wish to state that I have carefully considered factors on both sides of the argument, and I am convinced that the economy of our State and Nation would receive benefits far in excess of the costs involved.

As further evidence that the people of Texas regard this as a project to which many people have contributed, and in which no single person can claim all the credit for its progress thus far, it is worthwhile to note the response to Senator Tower's statement to the House committee.

Mr. L. H. Armstrong, traffic general foreman of General Dynamics in Fort Worth, said this:

I want to express my sincere appreciation for the statement you presented to the House Public Works Committee in support of the plan for development of the Trinity River Basin.

As a member of the Texas delegation which appeared at the recent hearing before the committee, I was greatly impressed, and I am sure the committee was, by the statements presented by the many Texas Members of Congress in support of the Trinity improvement plan.

From Mr. J. Lee Johnson III, executive vice president and general manager of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, came this statement:

I had the pleasure to be one of the delegates representing Texas before the House Public Works Committee at its recent hearing on the comprehensive plan for development of the Trinity River Basin, and I want to express to you my sincere thanks and appreciation for the statement you presented in support of this plan.

From Mr. Clyde Skeen, president of Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., of Dallas, came this statement:

It is very gratifying to see the support you are giving to the comprehensive plan of development for the Trinity River Basin of Texas.

From Roy Appleton, Jr., general manager of the Denton Record-Chronicle, came this response:

As a member of the Texas delegation that appeared recently before the House Public Works Committee at its hearing in regard to the development of the Trinity River Basin, I was most impressed by the work that has been done on this project by you and the other members of the Texas congressional delegation. As was pointed out by you and others at the hearing, this project has the wholehearted support of all Texans, and the time for action is now.

From Mr. W. Lamar Hamilton, of the Palestine Herald-Press, came this statement:

The interest you showed in our reception and dinner of August 11, was most appreciated, and the statement you presented on August 12, to the House Public Works

Committee was a masterpiece of factual information.

And from Mr. W. W. Lynch, president of the Texas Power & Light Co., came this statement:

I have heard many expressions of appreciation and I want to add mine with respect to your testimony before the House in regard to the Trinity River development program. You made a very important contribution.

These statements give ample evidence of the broad nature of support for the Trinity River development project, both in Texas and among those who represent Texas in the National Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to again commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for his very diligent and effective efforts in behalf of this project. I am sure that, without his assistance, it may never have been authorized by this Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the Trinity River Basin project, by any standard, is a huge undertaking. It is enormous in size, cost, vision, ambition, benefit, and merit. When completed, it will have cost \$1 billion and will be a fitting complement to the many other greatly meritorious and costly, multimillion-dollar projects which in our time have become a measure of our Nation's greatness. I refer to the Arkansas River, Puget Sound, the Missouri River, the Intracoastal Canal, the Mississippi River, the Cross Florida Canal, New York Harbor, and many others of which we can be and are justly proud.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if there is anything more tempting to a Member of Congress than voting for a public works project in his own district, it is the temptation to vote against a public works project in the other Member's district. Yet, yielding to either temptation would be irrational and destructive of the Nation's well-being if our judgments were not based strictly on the question of the merits of each individual public works project. It is with this in mind that I wish to examine the Trinity River Basin project.

This great river basin encompasses some 17,845 square miles of land and stretches some 360 miles from above Fort Worth, past Dallas, Corsicana, Palestine, and Liberty on down to the gulf coast near Houston. The basin is more than 100 miles wide above Fort Worth and furnishes livelihood and residence to 3 percent of the total population of our country. It has more people than are to be found in any one of 32 States of the United States.

The potential of the Trinity River Basin has long been recognized by the people of this great area as well as the people of the Nation. There are presently seven Corps of Engineers projects in various stages of planning and construction—four completed, two under construction, and one in planning stage; several local flood-protection projects

are in existence, and quite a few others have been authorized. State, local, and private funds in the amount of \$500 million have been spent or will be spent—\$269 million spent, and \$256 million pledged to be spent by reliable State, local, and private sources. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that would distinguish this great project from the other great projects throughout our country, it would be the investment of such large sums of State, local, and private funds.

The Trinity River Basin project is a great and worthwhile project. Like all meritorious public works projects, it is an investment in the future of our great Nation; and, more important, it is an expression of the confidence we have in ourselves and the future of our country.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to direct the attention of the House to two very necessary provisions in S. 2300 for the development of Calumet Harbor and River, Ill., and Ind., as authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved October 23, 1962.

The Calumet River is a connecting channel between Lake Michigan proper and the extensive harbor facilities of Lake Calumet. It provides the only link between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Cal-Sag Channel connection with the vast inland waterway system that serves the State of Illinois, the Midwest, and the whole center section of this country. It required deepening subsequent to the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and it still remains to be deepened. The public and private facilities located along the Calumet River, which represents an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars cannot be rendered fully capable of meeting their potential until the dredging of the channel to full seaway depth is completed.

In order to permit dredging to full project depth of 27 feet, the New York, Chicago & St. Louis—Nickel Plate—Railroad bridge and the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad bridge must be strengthened to withstand the channel deepening. Therefore, I am pleased that S. 2300 modifies the River and Harbor Act of 1962 in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers to provide this necessary protection for both bridges.

This development is overdue in that the full potential to the Chicago metropolitan area of the St. Lawrence Seaway and its connecting waterway with the Mississippi River will not be fully utilized until the navigation problems on the Calumet River have been completely solved.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, it has been my honor to serve in the Congress for 17 years. I have never served on any committee or sat through any hearings or heard any deliberations presided over in a more superb manner than by my friends, the Honorable BOB JONES, of Alabama, and the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota. These gentlemen presided with patience, understanding, and devotion to the welfare of our country beyond the call of duty. It was an inspiration to serve on the subcommittee with these great Americans. This bill before the House today is a result of their

tact, diplomacy, fairness, and dedication to the general welfare.

Mr. Chairman, our beloved and able chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, was always in the background, guiding, and counseling all of us. He is one of the greatest committee chairmen in the history of the Congress.

This bill and the projects it creates will be a monument to the genius of Mr. FALLON, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES, the senior members of the Public Works Committee, and an able, dedicated, and conscientious staff.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the bill is considered as read.

The question is on the committee substitute to the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 588, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by Mr. CLARK on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: Substitute the following language for the language on page 41, lines 4 through 12, inclusively:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project, which survey shall include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy, and to submit a report thereon to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966."

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

YEAS—207

Abbott	Andrews,	Baldwin
Adair	N. Dak.	Bates
Addabbo	Arends	Battin
Andrews,	Ashbrook	Belcher
Glenn	Ashmore	Bel

Berry	Grabowski	Nedzi
Betts	Gray	Nelsen
Boland	Griffin	O'Neill, Mass.
Bray	Griffiths	Morris
Brock	Gross	Perkins
Broomfield	Grover	Philbin
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Pike
Broyhill, Va.	Gurney	Pirnie
Buchanan	Halley	Poff
Burke	Hall	Quile
Burleson	Hallock	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanley	Randall
Cahill	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, Ill.
Callaway	Hardy	Reid, N.Y.
Carey	Harsha	Reifel
Casey	Harvey, Ind.	Reinecke
Cederberg	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Hays	Rhodes, Pa.
Chelf	Henderson	Rivers, Alaska
Clancy	Horton	Robison
Clark	Huot	Rogers, Tex.
Clausen,	Hutchinson	Rooner, Pa.
Don H.	Ichord	Roudebush
Clawson, Del.	Irwin	Rumsfeld
Cleveland	Jarman	Satterfield
Collier	Jennings	St Germain
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	St. Onge
Conte	Jonas	Saylor
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Schneebell
Corbett	Keith	Schweiker
Craley	Kelly	Secrest
Cramer	Keogh	Selden
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Shipley
Curtin	Kornegay	Shriver
Curtis	Kunkel	Sikes
Daddario	Laird	Skubitz
Dague	Langen	Slack
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Smith, Calif.
de la Garza	Lennon	Smith, N.Y.
Delaney	Lipscomb	Smith, Va.
Dent	Love	Stanton
Denton	McClory	Steed
Derwinski	McCulloch	Stratton
Devine	McDade	Talcott
Dickinson	McMillan	Taylor
Dole	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Dorn	Mailliard	Tuck
Dowdy	Marsh	Utt
Downing	Martin, Ala.	Vivian
Dulski	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Duncan, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Watkins
Dwyer	Mathias	Watson
Edwards, Ala.	Matthews	Watts
Ellsworth	May	Whalley
Erlenborn	Michel	White, Tex.
Findley	Minshall	Whitener
Fisher	Mize	Whitten
Flood	Monagan	Widnall
Fogarty	Moore	Williams
Fountain	Moorhead	Wilson, Bob
Fulton, Pa.	Morgan	Wolf
Fuqua	Morse	Wyatt
Glaime	Murray	Wylder
Goodell	Natcher	Younger

NAYS—185

Abernethy	Dyal	Hawkins
Adams	Edmondson	Hébert
Albert	Edwards, Calif.	Hechler
Anderson,	Evans, Colo.	Helstoski
Tenn.	Everett	Howard
Annunzio	Evins, Tenn.	Hull
Ashley	Fallon	Hungate
Aspinall	Farbstein	Jacobs
Bandstra	Fascell	Joelson
Barrett	Feighan	Johnson, Calif.
Beckworth	Flynt	Jones, Ala.
Bennett	Foley	Karsten
Bingham	Ford,	Karth
Blatnik	William D.	Kastenmeter
Boggs	Fraser	Kee
Bolling	Friedel	King, Calif.
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	King, Utah
Brooks	Gallagher	Kirwan
Brown, Calif.	Garmatz	Kluczynski
Burton, Calif.	Gathings	Krebs
Byrne, Pa.	Gettys	Landrum
Cabell	Gibbons	Leggett
Callan	Gilbert	Long, La.
Cameron	Gilligan	Long, Md.
Carter	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Celler	Green, Oreg.	McDowell
Clevenger	Green, Pa.	McFall
Cochran	Greig	McGrath
Conyers	Grider	McVicker
Corman	Hagan, Ga.	Macdonald
Culver	Hagen, Calif.	Machen
Daniels	Halpern	Mackay
Davis, Ga.	Hamilton	Mackie
Dawson	Hanna	Madden
Dingell	Hansen, Iowa	Matsunaga
Dow	Hansen, Wash.	Meeds
Duncan, Oreg.	Hathaway	Mills

Minish	Race	Sweeney
Mink	Redlin	Teague, Tex.
Moeller	Reuss	Tenzer
Morris	Rivers, S.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Morrison	Roberts	Todd
Moss	Rodino	Trimble
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Tunney
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Tupper
Murphy, N.Y.	Ronan	Tuten
Nix	Rooney, N.Y.	Udall
O'Hara, Mich.	Rosenthal	Ullman
O'Konski	Rostenkowski	Van Deerlin
Olsen, Mont.	Roush	Vanik
Olson, Minn.	Roybal	Vigorito
O'Neal, Ga.	Ryan	Waggonner
Ottinger	Scheuer	Walker, N. Mex.
Patman	Schisler	Weltner
Patten	Schmidhauser	White, Idaho
Pepper	Scott	Willis
Pickle	Sickles	Wilson,
Poage	Sisk	Charles H.
Pool	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Powell	Stafford	Yates
Price	Stalbaum	Young
Pucinski	Stubblefield	Zablocki
Purcell	Sullivan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Roncalio

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Brien
Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
George W.	Harris	Passman
Ayres	Herlong	Resnick
Baring	Hicks	Roosevelt
Bolton	Hollifield	Senner
Bonner	Holland	Springer
Bow	Hosmer	Staggers
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Okla.	Stephens
Colmer	Lindsay	Thomas
Diggs	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Farnsley	Miller	Toll
Farnum	Morton	
Fino	Mosher	

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Roncalio for, with Mr. Hicks against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Senner against.
Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Farnum against.
Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Resnick against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Farnsley against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Diggs against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Springer.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Thomas with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Messrs. ABERNETHY, POOL, O'KONSKI, and MOELLER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COOLEY, HANLEY, and BROOMFIELD changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hicks]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. POWELL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5842. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the bill S. 2127, an act to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes, with amendment in which concurrence of the House is requested.

HEMISFAIR 1968

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 583 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9247) to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto a final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pend-

ing that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. SPEAKER, House Resolution 583 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 9247 which provides for the participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate. It is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, the bill if adopted will provide for \$250,000 for survey money to examine into how the United States can participate in this project and how the participation of the United States can best be effectuated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. SPEAKER, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] has explained the rule in accordance with my understanding, in that House Resolution 583 will provide for 1 hour of general debate under an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 9247, which is a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to read into the RECORD a part or a portion of the legislation as set forth in the report which seems to be very concise and very complete to me, to the extent that H.R. 9247 grants congressional recognition to the international exposition, HemisFair 1968, which is planned to be held at San Antonio, Tex. in 1968, and which is designed to "enhance the existing brotherhood between New World nations, reaffirm common ties, increase understanding, and fortify world peace."

Second. The bill authorizes and requests the President, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition; and it directs the President to report to the Congress, during the first regular session of Congress after the date of the enactment of this legislation.

Third. It directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish a planning staff to conduct a study to determine the manner in which, and the extent to which, the United States shall be a participant in and an exhibitor at the HemisFair 1968, and grants him certain powers required to accomplish this assignment.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriation authorized for this study is \$250,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, but I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] that I do not have any requests for time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER (INTERAMA)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 582 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Florida, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there was no objection to this rule in the Committee on Rules. It provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 30 which comes to the House of Representatives from the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 30) would provide for the participation of the Government of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center located at Miami, Fla.—the nature, extent, and cost of such participation to be as recommended by the department or agency of the Government of the United States designated by the President in a report to the Congress by February 15 next to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was no opposition in the committee and I know of no controversy about the rule I urge the adoption of the rule and I yield to the able gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the able gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] this provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 30, a bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County.

My understanding of the purpose of the legislation is the same as that set forth by the gentleman from Florida. I would like to add, however, that the legislation authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$11 million for the U.S. participation in the Interama, subject to the condition that not more than \$250,000 of this amount may be available for the preparation of the report required to be submitted to the Congress not later than February 15, 1966. In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1 million annually for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1970 for the maintenance of U.S. installations and activities in Interama.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HEMISFAIR 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9247) to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9247, with Mr. OLSEN of Montana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 9247 provides for participation of the United States in HemisFair 1968, an international exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex. The bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$250,000 for the purpose of a study of the best way for the United States to participate in this exposition and the preparation of preliminary plans for such participation.

The legislation also gives the Secretary of Commerce the necessary authority to carry out the purposes of the act.

The Subcommittee on International Organization and Movements and the Committee on Foreign Affairs very carefully considered this proposal, and we believe this is a worthy project for the United States to participate in.

The sponsors of HemisFair 1968 have submitted sufficient evidence which indicates their proposed exposition meets the basic criteria for U.S. participation as set forth in the Federal Register of October 2, 1964; namely, that the project has received substantial support from the State of Texas, from the city of San Antonio, and from the local business community.

Further, the feasibility studies conducted by reputable organizations indicate this is an economically feasible project.

Finally, U.S. participation in HemisFair 1968 would not interfere with the securing of the approval of the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris for the U.S. Bicentennial Exposition which will be held in 1975 or 1976.

I would only add one other thing, Mr. Chairman. This method of legislating is the only way in which the Congress can make a decision with respect to these kinds of projects and the selection of sites. That is a congressional problem by virtue of the nonexistence of general legislation. So in refreshing our memory on this, I just want to repeat that if there were several sites proposed for international fairs for the same period of time, the determination whether the United States should participate in a particular exposition is a congressional determination, and we have to make it separately each time in each individual case.

This is the way we have been proceeding with respect to the authorization of projects of this type. At one time general legislation did exist for U.S. participation in domestic expositions. That authority, however, was removed by amendment in the other body, and we concurred in its removal. Therefore, we are back to the way in which we have proceeded throughout all the previous years, and that is by special authorization reviewed by the proper legislative committee, and sent through the normal appropriation route, for implementing U.S. participation in each specific project.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill does.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to one of the sponsors of this legislation who has worked very diligently on behalf of it and who has handled himself very ably before the committee in testifying on it, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, as the author of H.R. 9247, I want to extend my deep appreciation to Chairman MORGAN and Chairman FASCELL for the many courtesies they have given me and for the expeditious and businesslike handling of this bill.

H.R. 9247 does four things:

First. It grants congressional recognition to HemisFair, an international exposition, to be held in my hometown, San Antonio, Tex., in 1968.

Second. It authorizes and requests the President to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition; and it directs the President to report to Congress in the next session of Congress concerning the most effective way for the United States to participate.

Third. It directs the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study to determine the manner in and the extent to which the United States shall be a participant.

Fourth. It authorizes an appropriation of \$250,000 to carry out the study.

Mr. Chairman, few, if any, applicants for Federal participation in an international exposition to be held in this country have ever come before Congress with as much of the groundwork completed as HemisFair 1968. San Antonio has made a total communitywide commitment in the form of a nearly \$8 million voluntary subscription by local individuals, businesses and labor unions, and by passage of a \$30-million bond issue. The State of Texas, likewise, has committed its resources to the success of this great exposition. During the last session of the State legislature a \$4.5-million appropriation for HemisFair was voted and has since been signed by Gov. John Connally. The Governor himself has accepted the position of commissioner general for the exposition.

The planning study authorized by this bill will reveal the best, the most effective and the most economical way in which the United States can participate. It will be a wonderful and a most useful exposition, from the point of view of our involvement in the Alliance for Progress, as well as for general trade and cultural purposes. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this excellent project.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Dallas.

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from San Antonio, Tex., and to compliment the committee on approving this project.

The proposed undertaking will benefit not only San Antonio and the great southwestern area of the country, but also the United States as a whole. There is a tremendous background of history, Latin and Spanish culture in the San Antonio area, and the project will bring visitors not only from Latin America but from all over the world. They will gain an impression that will be long lasting.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to the other distinguished colleague from Dallas, Tex.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct honor and privilege to join with the gentlemen from Texas [EARLE CABELL and HENRY GONZALEZ] and other Texans in speaking in behalf of HemisFair.

I have been down in San Antonio and inspected HemisFair as the Congressman at large from Texas; I also represent San Antonio.

The HemisFair project is a great one. The people of San Antonio will be proud of this fair. It will do the American people a great deal of good. Our Latin American relations will be improved by this great gesture of better understanding and good will. I think it is a wonderful project. HENRY, I congratulate you for doing a tremendous job.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Today ought to be a red-letter day in the history of Texas, the House having approved the Trinity River project in the rivers and harbors bill, and now comes HemisFair. We have some idea of what the Trinity River project will cost us if it ever gets underway, but we do not know precisely what the HemisFair project will cost.

Mr. Chairman, we have set the precedent for Federal support of fairs by appropriating for the World's Fair in New York, the Seattle fair, and others at home and abroad. I assume that we can do no less than give some support to a fair even in the oil-rich State of Texas.

I do think that \$250,000 for survey or study money is out of line, because they seemed to do very well with \$125,000 in their study and survey in connection with the Seattle fair. Moreover, the Texas fair will be getting the benefit of the experience of those who put together the U.S. participation in the Seattle fair. So at the proper time it will be my purpose to offer an amendment to cut the authorization from \$250,000 to \$125,000, the amount allocated for the survey or study of the Federal Government's participation in the Seattle fair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, even though I do not represent the great State of Texas I do support this measure.

I cannot conceive of a major trade fair being held in San Antonio, drawing, as it obviously will, people from Latin America, without a very practical participation by the U.S. Government; so I feel we are doing a very necessary and practical thing in approving this measure.

I point out that the U.S. Information Agency conducts exhibits in various trade fairs around the world, most of them not nearly as good as they should be, because the USIA is a rather weak, spineless, ineffective propaganda arm of our Government. Nevertheless, the potential of a Federal Government exhibit at a fair is really beyond comprehension. I would hope that the good Texans, recognizing as they do the superior qualities of their State, would see to it that the Federal exhibit at the San Antonio fair would be as great and as noble as all of the things which are always undertaken in the State of Texas.

Mr. Chairman, for the same basic reasons I support H.R. 30, U.S. participation in the so-called Interama in the great State of Florida. I feel it would be inconsistent to conduct either one of these fairs without substantial and effective participation by our Government.

I should also mention that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] has been most active in urging support of this bill. This typifies the great spirit of unity which exists among the Texans.

Incidentally, may I point out to the Members of the House that Senator Tower has evidenced a vigorous interest in the leadership that must be forthcoming from the United States in deal-

ing with the problems in Latin America. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] recognizes, as evidently the Department of State does not, that it takes more than fancy slogans and dollars to solve the economic and political complications south of the border. He recognizes that U.S. leadership emphasizing principles of free enterprise and respect for constitutional government must be a major contribution on our part to the peoples of Latin America.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that it has not been my practice to automatically vote for the vast expenditures of funds so consistently authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, I feel that an investment in the two fairs is potentially well worth the money, and I urge approval by the House of both measures.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9247, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. In fact, I introduced a companion bill, H.R. 9533.

In 2½ years from now an international exposition will open in the historic city of San Antonio, Tex. This promises to be the largest and most significant exposition ever held in the Southwest. The purpose of the pending bill is to grant congressional recognition to this project, HemisFair 1968. In brief, the purpose of this fair will be to enhance the existing brotherhood between the nations of this hemisphere and to reaffirm common ties, increase understanding, and fortify world peace. These objectives are lofty and their promotion most appropriate and timely.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill authorizes an appropriation of \$250,000 to help finance the Federal planning which is required before there can be actual Federal participation in the exhibits.

This exposition was initiated by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and has solid local and State support. The State of Texas has provided \$4.5 million, and has committed itself to an additional \$3 million later. The people of San Antonio, by a vote of 3½ to 1, approved a \$30 million bond issue, to support the project. In addition, the 26 banks in San Antonio advanced \$4½ million, and the businessmen of the Alamo City pledged \$7.5 million.

Thus, it can be seen that there is solid support on the local level, and very limited additional cost will be involved so far as the Federal Government is concerned. It is most important, however, that the project be given congressional approval. Once that is done, it will be in order for the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to participate, and it will then be in order for the Bureau of International Expositions, to approve the exposition.

Mr. Chairman, this exposition has the approval of the President of the United States, of the Governor of Texas, of the Department of Commerce, the State Department, and indeed of all who have

had occasion to express judgment with respect to it.

The year 1968 will mark the 250th anniversary of beautiful and romantic old San Antonio—the home of the Alamo and the cradle of Texas liberty.

The exposition is designed to display the very best of the Americas, and will feature their achievements in commerce, industry, agriculture, science, and also the arts, education, and the professions. The project will advance international understanding, respect, and interdependence by featuring the merging of civilizations of one continent to form a brotherhood of free and independent nations, all seeking the same lofty objectives. Indeed, the theme of the exposition will be "The Confluence of the Civilizations of the Americas."

Mr. Chairman, the importance and the attractiveness of this great project cannot be overemphasized. The good that it will accomplish can hardly be estimated. Its timing coincides with the 1968 Olympics in Mexico City, and San Antonio, the "Gateway to Latin America," will be an appropriate stopover for those en route to the Olympics. There they will see not only the magnificent exhibits located on the 92½-acre exposition site, but only 2 blocks away will be able to gaze upon the Alamo itself, a sacred shrine in the history of man's struggle for freedom and liberty.

I feel sure that before the exposition is concluded every Member of the Congress will want to visit San Antonio, enjoy the traditional Texas hospitality, and participate by your presence in this great promotion of international good will and understanding.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I commend my colleague. I wish to associate myself with his remarks. I support the legislation. I believe nothing could happen in this country which would be of more importance in respect to our Latin American relations.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from San Angelo and to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my colleague from San Antonio, and all of the members who have worked so hard to bring this fine measure before this House. I enthusiastically support this bill.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON].

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are enough Texans speaking on this subject, but as a member of the subcommittee of which the able gentleman from Florida is chairman, I do want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and his associates from San Antonio, Tex., for presenting in a most interesting and effective way their proposal for HemisFair. I have never seen anything more thor-

oughly, more convincingly, or more attractively presented than this legislation before the Committee. I enthusiastically support them in these efforts. I also take this opportunity to express the appreciation of those of us from Texas for the interest, understanding and support of the Subcommittee and the full Committee on Foreign Affairs in this worthy plan. I trust we may have the unanimous support of the House and in advance assure you of our gratitude.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate today as I rise in support of this bill, providing for U.S. participation in the 1968 HemisFair Exposition at San Antonio, that I call to the attention of my colleagues House Concurrent Resolution 465 which I have introduced expressing the sense of Congress that Philadelphia should be designated the host city for the 1976 National Bicentennial Celebration commemorating 2 centuries of independence.

I have today received from the Philadelphia City Council its unanimous resolution of September 16 memorializing the House to enact House Concurrent Resolution 465. It is my great hope that the House will move quickly and favorably upon this matter.

Through passage of House Concurrent Resolution 465, the Congress would express its enthusiasm and encouragement for Philadelphia's plans for such a bicentennial celebration.

Philadelphia was the meeting place of the First Continental Congress. The Declaration of Independence was signed and first read to the people in Philadelphia. It is most appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to that Declaration in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I introduce the memorializing resolution of the Philadelphia City Council and ask that it be referred to the Judiciary Committee which is considering my proposal.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time to insert at this point the text of the memorializing resolution and the covering letter from Philadelphia City Council President Paul D'Ortona:

CITY COUNCIL,
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
September 20, 1965.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWEIKER: I am privileged to forward to you a certified copy of resolution No. 148, entitled: "Resolution memorializing the House of Representatives of the United States to enact House Concurrent Resolution No. 465, which expresses the sense of Congress that Philadelphia should be designated the host city for the 1976 National Bicentennial Celebration commemorating two centuries of independence."

This resolution was adopted unanimously by the council of the city of Philadelphia at a meeting held September 16, 1965.

Respectfully,

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President, City Council.

RESOLUTION 148

Resolution memorializing the House of Representatives of the United States to enact House Concurrent Resolution 465, which expresses the sense of Congress that Philadelphia should be designated the host city for the 1976 National Bicentennial Celebration commemorating two centuries of independence

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that a national celebration shall take place in 1976 to commemorate our Nation's 200 years of independence; and

Whereas our Nation was born in Independence Hall in Philadelphia and it was here the Declaration of Independence was signed and first announced to the people in 1776 and these buildings are still standing and have become a national shrine; and

Whereas no other city is as rich as Philadelphia in historical background connected with the founding of our Nation; and

Whereas Philadelphia was the site of the Nation's centennial celebration in 1876 and the sesquicentennial in 1926; and

Whereas while Philadelphia is rich in history it is also modern in the accommodations and entertainment which could be offered to visitors; and

Whereas a Philadelphia Bicentennial Committee of prominent citizens has been formed and its studies show that a national celebration would be artistically successful and would financially benefit all Pennsylvanians: Therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to enact House Concurrent Resolution 465, which expresses the sense of Congress that Philadelphia is the Nation's most qualified city to host a national celebration commemorating 200 years of independence in the United States of America and the two Houses of Congress view with enthusiasm and encouragement the efforts of Philadelphia citizens to plan a national celebration in Philadelphia in 1976.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Members of Congress representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFMAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure. I would like to point out that in this day and time each section of our country has great pride in its own environment. We have put particular emphasis on the education of the North and East and the other scientific centers. I point out that in the great Southwest our civilization goes back further than does that of any other part of the country.

In connection with this exposition in 1968, HemisFair, I think the great Southwest will take great pride in pointing out that the roots of civilization and of our culture in these United States and, indeed, in Latin and Central America are deeper here than in any other section of the Americas.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues from Texas, and especially my colleague from San

Antonio in support of this legislation. My district is to the south of San Antonio. I represent some 300 miles on the Rio Grande River, along the Mexican border. We know full well that any amount that we spend cannot be sufficient to better the wonderful relations or continue the wonderful relations that we have with our immediate neighbor to the south and all of the other countries south of her.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to my colleague from Iowa that this is certainly a red letter day, when he joins us Texans in this effort. I should like further to tell him that if he would be so generous and make it a gold letter day by withdrawing his proposed amendment, his name will be put inside the Alamo alongside the other heroes who fought for Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], in his enthusiasm for this exciting HemisFair proposal.

San Antonio leaders and citizens have been working diligently for many months in the interest of a well-planned and well-directed exposition.

The city of San Antonio is an ideal site for such an event. It is the gateway and meeting place where the cultures of Latin and North America meet and mingle.

I am certain that this exposition will do much for our hemispheric relations, and I feel sure the House will adopt this bill.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, nearly 4 years ago, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, first proposed that the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio, Tex., be celebrated with a Fair of the Americas.

Today, the culmination of his efforts is before this House in H.R. 9247, providing for U.S. participation in this great undertaking.

Now known as "HemisFair," it is dedicated to the people of all the Americas to whom we in the Southwest are so closely tied. It is estimated that in 1968, more than 10 million people will visit this showcase of all that is good in the Western Hemisphere—and there is little doubt in my mind but that the eyes of the world will view the fair through our television satellites.

The people of Harris County, Tex., some 200 miles distant, support the great effort of our sister city in commemorating its 250th anniversary. We share not only the great heritage of our State's history, but the same deep and abiding interest in, and friendship for, our good neighbors to the south. HemisFair will not only benefit San Antonio, but in my judgment will be of great help to all areas of our State and our Nation. For this reason, it is a privilege for me to support H.R. 9247.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress

hereby recognizes the international exposition, HemisFair 1968 (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "exposition"), which is being held at San Antonio, Texas, in 1968, as an event designed to enhance the existing brotherhood between new world nations, reaffirm common ties, increase understanding, and fortify world peace. The purposes of such exposition are to—

(1) honor and display the diversified cultures of Pan America, including the history, art, industry, commerce, and economic development of each of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, their interrelationships and common ties, and the contributions to their development from Europe, Asia, and Africa;

(2) encourage, coincident with the Olympic Games being held in Mexico City in 1968, tourist travel in and to the United States, stimulate foreign trade, and promote cultural exchanges; and

(3) commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of historic bilingual San Antonio, "the gateway of Latin America".

SEC. 2. (a) To implement the recognition declared in the first section of this Act, the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, shall cooperate with the State of Texas with respect to, and determine the extent to which the United States shall be a participant in and an exhibitor at, the exposition.

(b) The President is authorized and requested, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out his duties under section 2(a) of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish a planning staff to conduct a study to determine the manner in which and the extent to which the United States shall be a participant in and an exhibitor at the exposition, and to report thereon to the Secretary of Commerce and the President.

(b) (1) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, such consultants and experts as he deems to be necessary to assist the planning staff established under subsection (a). Persons so appointed as consultants and experts, who are not otherwise employed by the United States, shall be (A) paid compensation at a rate not to exceed \$100 per diem while engaged in the work of such planning staff, and (B) reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses incurred while so engaged, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(2) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of the members of such planning staff and such secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistants as may be necessary to enable such planning staff to perform its functions, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties.

SEC. 4. The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce with respect to determining the manner in which and the extent to which the United States shall be a participant in and an exhibitor at the exposition; and

(2) to make available to the Secretary of Commerce, from time to time, on a reimbursable basis, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out his functions under this Act.

SEC. 5. The President shall report to the Congress during the first regular session of Congress which begins after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to (1) the findings derived from the study referred to in section 3, together with such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce and the President may deem appropriate concerning the most effective manner of representation of the United States at the exposition, and (2) the amount of appropriations which are necessary to accomplish such representation.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$250,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. FASCELL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 5, line 2, strike the figure "\$250,000" and insert "\$125,000"

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that I cannot accept the kind offer of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I first visited the Alamo many years ago. I am sorry that by offering the amendment I have to forfeit in this fashion my right to the recognition in the Alamo which he offered.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because I am convinced the expenditure can very well be limited to \$125,000.

Without repeating my previous argument, I again point to the fact that this was the amount allotted to the Seattle Fair for the preliminary study and there was no complaint that the amount was inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why \$125,000 would not be completely adequate to determine the amount and the kind of participation by the U.S. Government in this project.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Does not the gentleman know the old saying, that you have to fly twice as fast as a normal liar, in order to keep up with the truth about Texas? Therefore, this request is perhaps in order, to have twice as much study money as we had for the Seattle Fair in Federal study and participation.

Mr. GROSS. I can see that my good friend from Missouri is well acquainted with Texas and Texans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I address myself to this amendment not only as a member of the subcommittee who sat through all of the hearings on this matter, but also as a member of the board of directors of the New York World's Fair. I have had some experience—some of it quite unhappy—with fairs of this type.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that I was more than cautious, perhaps because of my experience, than some of my other colleagues and because of that fact, I was very much interested in the report of the economic consultants who testified in support of the San Antonio fair.

Mr. Chairman, I was very, very much convinced that they had been most conservative in their projection of attendance, and I am completely satisfied as to the proposed financial success of HemisFair.

Mr. Chairman, I was also very much impressed by the fact that they had hired a Mr. Dingwall, who had been the executive vice president of the Seattle World's Fair. Mr. Dingwall addressed himself to the matter that Seattle had used only \$125,000 in their original plans. As related to this inquiry, Mr. Dingwall said at page 22 of the hearings as follows:

We have asked for more here than Seattle did some years ago because we did hope—Seattle asked for \$125,000 and we doubled that because we would hope that there could be some design work undertaken along with the writing of the program for full participation.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dingwall was supported in that position by Mr. Perry, who was in charge of the design and architecture for the proposed HemisFair and he said on page 23 of the hearings as follows:

It was our consideration that architectural work of a schematic nature should accompany the program work done by those authorized under this legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, in explaining this as a result of an inquiry from my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] as to what "schematic" meant, Mr. Perry said:

A schematic design to an architect is a technical term which comprises the beginning stages of architectural work. It includes conceptual design and analysis and preliminary cost estimates. This would accompany the programing done by those who would be doing the exhibit planning.

He further explained to us, and completely to my satisfaction and to that of the subcommittee, that by doubling the amount they could not only save money but save time, that they would do much of the architectural design and project work in the initial stages so that the net effect, by doing this at the same time they were doing the programing with reference to the initial inquiry as to the feasibility and the type structure we would have, the net result would be a substantial savings to the United States and would probably result in a finer and more appropriate exhibit and would in the long run save time.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsors of the resolution, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and his supporters, did an excellent job in the presentation submitted to us. They included a complete statement of figures and a projection of expenditures which reached the sum of \$250,000, and indicated that if there were something less than that spent, they would only ask for what they actually needed.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this was the wise way to approach it, and for these reasons I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was intrigued by the fact that it was necessary for a member of the committee from New York to rise to defend this fair in San Antonio. I would like to point out to the Members of the House—I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will bear me out—that it was our intention—as we discussed the matter in the subcommittee—that the Commerce Department, in working on these plans, assumes that there will be no question of participation so that the major emphasis will be to produce the most practical possible exhibit. This survey is not in the nature of deciding whether or not we shall participate; it is based on the premise that participation will take place. Therefore, as the gentleman pointed out, the funds will be a practical investment in the final project. It is more than a plan to determine a course of action. I do not think there is any need of reducing this amount, but, on the other hand, it must be utilized to the most practical extent possible, keeping in mind the ultimate objective.

I feel that the amendment, although moderate of the normal standpoint of the gentleman from Iowa, should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLSEN of Montana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9247) to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 583, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER (INTERAMA)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 30), with Mr. OLSEN of Montana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 30, as amended, provides for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., known as Interama. It authorizes the President to invite the several States of the United States and foreign countries to take part in this exposition, and to appoint a commissioner for Interama who shall perform such duties as the President may assign to him. Further, the bill provides certain powers to the head of a department or agency designated by the President, to carry out U.S. participation in Interama. The head of such department or agency is directed to report on the proposed nature and extent of U.S. participation during the early part of the forthcoming session of the Congress, and other agencies of the executive branch are authorized to cooperate with him, on a reimbursable basis, in fulfilling his duties.

The legislation, in section 5, authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$11 million to carry out the above stated purposes, as well as an appropriation of not to exceed \$1 million for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1970 for the maintenance of the U.S. exhibit at Interama.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has given very careful study to this legislation. The concept of Interama as a permanent year-round, nonprofit, self-sustaining enterprise for the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Republics of Latin America, has already been endorsed by the Congress and granted recognition in a Presidential proclamation. This is a carefully thought out undertaking and the plans for it are being implemented in accordance with the very thorough and well documented feasibility studies conducted by several research firms with extensive experience in the recreational and exposition fields.

To date, Interama has obtained financial resources and commitments which already approach \$150 million and give evidence of substantial local support, both governmental and private, for this project. The full scope of this proposed \$500 million undertaking is explained in detail in the statistical table which appears in the appendix to the report filed on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention one more thing: After careful consideration of H.R. 30 in open hearings and executive sessions, our committee has amended the text of the bill so as to make it conform to the principles and procedures which our Government has used in the past and is using currently, in participating in various international expositions. We also received assurances from the executive branch that U.S. participation in Interama will not interfere

with the securing of the approval of the Bureau of International Expositions for the celebration of the U.S. Bicentennial to be held in 1975 or 1976.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we strongly recommend that the legislation be passed.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to yield to one of the sponsors of this legislation, the principal sponsor, my distinguished colleague from the same area that I have the honor to represent, who today sees the opportunity for at least a partial fulfillment of a lifelong dream which he initiated many, many years ago and which has been close to his heart for all this long period of time—a man who has made an outstanding record in the other body and who is now building for himself an outstanding record in this body. It is really a privilege for me to yield such time as he may require to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I thank my able and very generous colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for his kind references to me. I particularly want to commend him for the splendid leadership he has given not only on this measure but to so many other measures that have had the attention and the favorable consideration of the House of Representatives to promote trade and cultural exchange and friendship and cooperation between the United States and Latin American countries, which is the primary aim and purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that this bill has the complete support of the Florida delegation in both Houses of the Congress. While this bill, H.R. 30, happens to be my bill which is being considered by the House of Representatives today as amended by the able Committee on Foreign Affairs, all the members of the Florida delegation with the exception of one, introduced a companion bill.

I am very pleased to say that the two able Republican members of our Florida delegation introduced the same bill and they have given strong and most helpful and commendable support to this project all along the road of its consideration in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, as my able colleague has been generous enough to say, this is an old dream to many of us—and great credit for its maturity goes to many. I do not claim to be the first to advocate this inspiring center, although my wife and I for nearly a third of a century following the example of others ahead of us, have done what we could to push this great project forward to bring about a closer relationship and understanding and a greater degree of cultural and business exchange between the United States and the Latin American countries.

All of us believe that to a great extent the destiny of freedom in the world will be determined by the cooperation, the unity, and the strength in dedication to peace and progress on the part of the nations that make up our Western Hemisphere.

As my able colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has said, the proposed project happens to lie in my district, in the northern part of Biscayne Bay, although very proximate also to the district of my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. Yet I did not come to be a supporter of this project when it came to lie in my district, proud as I am that I can represent a district in which this great project is conceived and, I hope, will come to its magnificent maturity.

In March 1941, when I had the honor to be a Member of the other body, and when I lived in Tallahassee, Fla., in the northern part of the State—almost 500 miles from where this project lies—I introduced in that body a bill the title of which was “to provide for the establishment of a Pan American Center at Miami, Fla., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American Republics, and for other purposes.”

In 1950, both Houses of Congress passed measures of which I was one of the authors in the other body. On August 25, 1950, the House passed one of those resolutions, the “resolving” part of which I should like to read:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby expresses its endorsement of the establishment of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Miami as a permanent year-round, nonprofit self-sustaining enterprise for the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Republics of Latin America.

In 1952, in January, President Truman, pursuant to the provisions of that resolution adopted by the Congress, said—and I quote only a part of the declaration:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, in consonance with the Joint Resolution, do hereby call upon officials and agencies of the Government to assist and cooperate with the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Miami, Fla., and I invite the participation of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere therein.

Mr. Chairman, all that remains before this great project comes into establishment, early maturity, and fruition is the assurance of participation by the Government of the United States, for assurance of participation by our Government will assure participation by the countries of Latin America. Everything is now ready for the wheels to move toward completion of the project when this resolution is adopted. I hope it will be speedily adopted in this House and in the other body. State, county, and local authorities in Florida have advanced \$882,000 to inaugurate and to forward Interama.

We have 1,700 acres of land in the northern part of Biscayne Bay as the site of the center, 680 acres of which have already been prepared for building sites. This land provided by the city of Miami has been appraised as worth \$54 million.

We now have arrangements with private utilities, including telephone, power, and light, to put \$15 million worth of instrumentalities in the center.

We have a commitment from the State of Florida to build \$6 million of access and interior roads to and through the site.

We have a commitment from Goodbody & Co. to grant the authority, which is a State agency, of which the Governor of Florida is the honorary chairman—one member is the president of the First National Bank of Miami, the largest bank in Florida—an additional \$13 million. By letter Goodbody has already said that it is ready to turn that money over to the authority on the basis of a feasibility report prepared by Economic Research Associates, an outstanding research agency in America. That firm, which is located in Los Angeles, made the same inquiry for Seattle and many similar expositions. That makes a total of \$21 million advanced by one of the outstanding private bond houses of America—\$8 million having already been advanced to the authority by Goodbody, part of which has been used in the preparation of the site.

In addition, we have an additional commitment from Goodbody & Co. for \$10 million, without any relation to the Federal Government, for building a \$10 million freedom tower.

The theme of this great project is the American way of life—progress with freedom. From the city of North Miami \$3,800,000 is committed for the installation of water and sewerage facilities.

In addition, we have a commitment of \$12 million from International Trade Mart, a private agency; and in addition to that we have a commitment from the Community Facilities Administration for a loan, adequately secured, as the research agencies have assured, of \$22 million, to build all the buildings required for the participation of the Latin American countries and for the Government of the United States.

In fact \$4.5 million of \$18.5 million principal borrowed from CFA by the Miami authority, the total amount of the loan, including service charges, being \$22 million—is for the building of a suitable building to house the exhibit of the Government of the United States, for which exhibit or participation we seek authority under this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, this great project which will mean so much to the progress of freedom in our hemisphere is awaiting only a commitment for participation by the Government of our country in a suitable character in the center to become an exciting reality.

Our attention was called by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the other body, during the hearings, to the fact that this bill as originally drafted was an open-end authorization. It was said, “You do not have any limitation on the amount of authorization.”

We had provided in the original bill that the character of the exhibit by the United States, the extent of it and its cost, should be as recommended by the department or the agency of the Government designated by the President—such report to be made to the Speaker and to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the Appropriations Committee of the other body—and as the Appropria-

tions Committees of the two Houses might determine to be appropriate for a suitable exhibit or for suitable participation in the center, by our Government. We preferred to leave it that way.

But to satisfy those who felt there should be a ceiling to the authorization we put in a limitation of \$11 million as the maximum cost the Government of the United States could incur. But the amount of the governmental expenditure will be determined by the recommendation of the department or agency appointed by the President, and of course by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The matter will have the consideration of the Bureau of the Budget of the executive branch of the Government also.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee this is a meritorious project. It will create a center in Miami, where there is a keen awareness of our intimate relationship with our Latin American friends which will excitingly portray all the free nations of the Americas; a great center designed in a beautiful Florida setting by the outstanding architects of the Americas, where there will be a coming together of the people of the Americas in the four aspects of the project which are contemplated in the design—international, industrial, cultural and festival—all to promote human dignity and freedom.

I add, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I hope and pray that the great capstone of this project, when it comes to its magnificent completion, will be a truly great Inter-American University in connection with the University of Miami where, in the fallow ground of American democracy, boys and girls from Latin America may come to study, and to then go home to be the leaders in the propagation and defense of democratic faith in the Latin American countries, which are so essential to our security and our welfare in our hemisphere.

With all my heart, Mr. Chairman, I commend this authorization to my colleagues in this Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. I should like to ask some questions of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Is this considered to be a permanent or a somewhat temporary—meaning over a period of years—establishment?

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, it will be a permanent establishment.

Mr. ADAIR. Second, is it to be regarded as something in the nature of a trade fair? Could the gentleman give us a little more detail as to precisely what is to be accomplished?

Mr. FASCELL. It will be more than a trade fair, because its basic concept involves both cultural and trade considerations. It will have all of the normal things one would associate with an international exposition, but it will go far beyond that, in that the exhibits will not be static but will be flexible exhibits, in the sense of the normal kinds of exhibits one thinks of in an exposition.

Also, there will be opportunity for the presentation of the cultures of the various countries that participate, Latin American and others, in the form of symphonies, dances, art exhibits, and other types of cultural exhibits. In addition, there will be the normal kind of a trade mart and recreation area, together with opportunities for seminars, conferences, and that kind of thing. So this is a combination of every kind of concept in the field of expositions that you might think of, but not a normal trade exposition within the narrow meaning of that term. It is not simply a place where producers and buyers of products come to exchange ideas with respect to their products and to carry on commercial transactions. The opportunity for that would exist, but this center is not limited to that concept. That is the reason why it has the name cultural and trade fair.

Mr. ADAIR. I understood the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to say that this is a hemispheric effort, or it is so envisioned. In other words, participation will be invited from all nations of this Western Hemisphere.

Mr. FASCELL. It will be all nations, I will tell the gentleman. The emphasis, of course, is on this hemisphere because of the nature of its concept; that is, of an inter-American exhibition. However, it will be open to all nations except those that are Communist dominated.

Mr. ADAIR. So that if a European country wanted to participate, it might do so?

Mr. FASCELL. Very definitely. Yes, sir.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I heartily endorse what my able colleague said, but the only difference is our authority, with the money that we borrow is going to build the buildings for the Latin American countries without any cost to them and furnish it to them. Their architects will participate with ours. Six of the outstanding architects in America headed by Mr. Edward Durrell Stone and Mr. Cerf, dean of architecture at Harvard. However, in the case of all foreign countries other than those in our hemisphere, they will pay for their own buildings.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to ask either of the two gentlemen from the Miami area for a little further clarification as to the financial aspect of the matter. As I understand it, the request is for an authorization of \$11 million to which is to be added the authorization for four annual \$1 million appropriations.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. It is so stated in the report.

Mr. ADAIR. So the request is for a total at this time of \$15 million.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. It is not to exceed \$15 million.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it anticipated 4 or 5 years hence it may be necessary to come in and ask for further authorization, or is it anticipated at that time the institution will be self-maintaining?

Mr. FASCELL. It is not anticipated that there will be any further requests

for authorizations. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. My final question is this: There have been a number of figures mentioned by both of you gentlemen. What is expected to be the overall cost of the establishment of this institution?

Mr. FASCELL. It is projected at this point that the total cost of development will be in the neighborhood of \$500 million when the project is completed.

Mr. ADAIR. I am not clear as to how much the State of Florida as a State is putting in.

Mr. FASCELL. The State of Florida is coming into the project in various aspects of it, both with direct cash, which has been made available heretofore to the State authority called the International Cultural and Trade Center Authority, and also by virtue of a commitment with respect to the construction of access and other roads in the project amounting to approximately \$6 million—or \$5.9 million, I believe, to be exact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, the State has already started on the construction, or has made commitments with respect to the first \$3 million of construction. So you have a total participation of better than \$6 million by the State thus far.

Mr. ADAIR. How about the county of Dade or the city of Miami?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, the county participated with respect to moneys actually heretofore made available to the Authority for necessary preliminary expenses in the sum of several hundred thousand dollars. I have forgotten the exact amount, but it is detailed in the record of the hearing and the report. The city of Miami, of course, is making the land available to the Authority under a subordination agreement, 1,700 acres of land, title to which was actually owned by the city of Miami and transferred to the State authority.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman anticipate that there will be any further Federal contribution beyond the amount asked here?

Mr. FASCELL. We know of none.

Mr. ADAIR. Then the balance of the money, of the \$500 million, to which reference was made, would come from private sources or other nations?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct. It will come from the bonded financing which has already been arranged, and which has been alluded to and is detailed in the report, and includes all of the other construction and other contributions that will be made either by private organizations, other governments, or through other sources. It would be non-U.S. Federal, in other words.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to emphasize that this is a far different proposition than that of the previous bill providing for what is called HemisFair, at San Antonio, Tex. That, I hope,

will be a one-shot affair, insofar as a Federal appropriation is concerned. This is a permanent institution.

I am far from convinced that the Federal Government, although it has already put up or has made available \$22 million through a so-called loan under the Community Facilities Administration, and another \$11 million is asked for in this bill, has seen the end of the Federal financing of this project as it now stands.

I sat through the hearings on this bill. I cannot understand why, with \$54 million worth of real estate allegedly dedicated to this project, Floridians cannot take care of the financing without going so deeply into the Federal Treasury. I am not convinced that they are going to be able, through revenues from this Interama, to retire the loan that has been made. In other words, I think that already too much dependence has been put upon the Federal Government in this affair. Moreover, I am not aware that in the development of the Trade Center in New York that the Federal Government has put up a dime so far. It is my understanding that the city of New York is raising a considerable amount of money on its own from various sources other than the Federal Government—from private and public sources in the State and city of New York to establish its trade center.

And for the first time this afternoon I heard Interama emphasized as a cultural center as well as a trade center. I am now at a loss now to know whether it is to be a cultural center or a trade center.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I notice in a letter to the committee of which the gentleman from Iowa is a member, addressed to the chairman of the committee, dated September 8, 1965, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations states that:

The Bureau of the Budget is unable to advise as to the administration's position on this matter.

Does that mean that the Bureau of the Budget has not taken a position and the administration is not either in favor of or against this proposal?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that so far as I can remember we had no witness representing the Bureau of the Budget before the subcommittee that held hearings on the bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I was reading from a letter that appears on page 6 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I am aware of the letter.

Mr. JONAS. Can we find out whether the administration has a position for or against this project?

Mr. GROSS. I would suggest—and I yield to the gentleman for the purpose—that he ask the sponsors of the legislation that question.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida

whether this correctly sets forth the fact that the administration has not expressed an opinion for or against the proposal?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would not want to add or detract from anything which the letter says, because I think it is self-explanatory. It simply says that the departments in their submission of reports were not able to obtain the normal pro forma statements, and the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the submission of the report as far as the President's program is concerned. I would further state that we normally do not call and have not called any representative from the Bureau of the Budget to determine what their position is with respect to the Bureau of the Budget.

As the gentleman well knows, the only reason the statement is in there at all is because under the Executive procedure all departments are required to clear their reports with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JONAS. I might add that there is another sentence in this letter from the Department of State which concerns me, and it reads as follows:

But before the Federal Government makes a commitment to become a permanent exhibitor it would seem reasonable to confirm by some independent study the likelihood of participation in this event by U.S. private enterprise and Latin American countries.

That would seem to be a recognition at least on behalf of the Department of State that we not go forward with this until these questions are cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not think that interpretation is going to be put on that language. I would simply say, though, that the economic feasibility studies which are available and which are a part of the record do not have that reservation at all, as has been testified to before the committee and which I think has substantially satisfied our members. And even these economic feasibility studies are most conservative. So I do not quite understand the applicability of the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina or the interpretation which the gentleman from North Carolina places on this with reference to his reservations in the matter.

Mr. JONAS. I am not making any reservation at all. I am asking for a clarification. The letter from the Department of State was written apparently as is stated in the first sentence, in reply to a request from Chairman MORGAN for the views of the Department. What I have read is a part of the views.

Mr. FASCELL. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. And, I just wondered whether there had been any subsequent change or whether the gentleman could now tell us whether there is approval of this project on the part of the adminis-

tration or whether it is neutral or negative.

Mr. FASCELL. I think their statement of position is as expressed in that letter, and I do not want to add anything to it or take anything from it, as I said earlier. This is the reason for the report. I would simply say there certainly would not be any reservation at all with respect to the feasibility study because that has been made by one of the best organizations we have, and as I stated, in a very conservative manner.

With reference to the question of feasibility and talking about the economics of it, it can stand on its own. There might be a difference of opinion as to how many exhibitors you are going to have or just how much participation, until you actually get into the mechanics of the thing.

For example, in Seattle and New York we did not have any idea as to how many people were going to participate when we started. So one could naturally and normally have a reservation with respect to the extent of participation by the people. I see nothing wrong with that reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I say again that we must understand, in the consideration of this legislation, that here we are being asked to underwrite a permanent fair or trade center or cultural center, whatever you want to call it—I say again I am far from convinced that the \$22 million which the Federal Government has allegedly on loan in this case, and the \$11 million which is called for in this bill, will be the end of the financing on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the bill, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I want to remind the Members that with respect to the New York World's Fair, the Federal participation was \$17 million. The only way the U.S. Government can participate in these fairs and expositions is for us to authorize the appropriation and have the Appropriations Committee appropriate the money. Normally the Department of Commerce discharges the operational functions.

In comparison with any of the projects we have had before us in the past 10 years, this one will stand on its own merits as being as good or better than any other one. The feasibility studies bear that out.

I do not see any reason for concern with respect to the permanent nature of this matter because we have a limitation on the authorization. The authorization is also subject to the normal appropriation processes. Further, I see nothing to be concerned about with respect to the facilities and the exposition itself. By all of the criteria for U.S. participation, by any standards we have used in the

past, or we may expect to use in the future, I would think that we could go ahead with this project.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of Interama legislation, I strongly support the measure before the House today, and urge its adoption.

This week this House adopted a resolution supporting the actions of the President in upholding freedom in this hemisphere by force if necessary. As an expression of the sense of the House the overwhelming support on this resolution clearly indicates our feeling that the wave of communism must be stopped in order to guarantee the freedom of the peoples of the Caribbean and of our own country as well.

Interama is a fitting sequel. By promoting international understanding through trade and commerce, it will stand as a monument to the cooperation of freedom-loving people throughout North and South America.

At the crossroad of inter-American travel, Interama will be a center for cultural exchange and cooperation.

Interama will be proof that the people of the United States have trust and faith in the future of good relations between our own Nation and our sister Republics of this hemisphere. It will be a cornerstone of a new understanding through peaceful means to the mutual benefit of all, so that we can build a more durable bridge between our people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to support this bill, H.R. 30, and my distinguished colleagues from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. FASCELL].

The bill has been fully explained. I would like to perhaps emphasize this aspect: While we are here asking for an authorization for a permanent exhibit in this trade center on the part of the U.S. Government, what we have is a joint venture of the local people, the State people, and the Federal Government. As has been pointed out, the city of Miami has put up 1,700 acres of extremely valuable land for the site this trade center will be erected on. The State of Florida has made a substantial contribution as an additional investment, and has also pledged the cost of the roads in the center. The Authority is borrowing up to \$21 million to develop the center. Actually, the private public utilities companies in the area expect to invest about \$15 million in furnishing utilities for this permanent exposition. So it is indeed a joint venture with financial participation at all levels of government.

It will serve two purposes: First, an economic purpose. It will generate a tremendous amount of activity for this part of Florida, and for the whole State of Florida and, for that matter, all of the United States and, second, of great importance is the good relations it will generate with our Latin American neighbors.

Presidents have supported this as far back as President Truman and President Eisenhower, as well as the Congress itself. I would like to refer to what a Republican President said in a proclamation concerning this project:

The effective functioning of the center will encourage the mutually beneficial exchange of goods and services between the nations of the Western Hemisphere, thereby fostering the solidarity of the American Republics.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sound measure and I fully support it. I hope the Members on our side support it too as well as those on the Democrat side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am unalterably opposed to this grab of the taxpayers' money for whatever the benefit may be—cultural or hemispherical solidarity—or trade fair or exposition—on any other basis. We do enough for these things, and notions through the U.N. and its offshoots—foreign aid, the OAS and so forth.

It seems to me it is time the House of Representatives, the people's personal Representatives, elected on a biennial basis, because they are the keepers of the taxpayers' money, of the Treasury, the exchequer and as I say, I think it is time the House of Representatives called a sudden halt and dug their heels into the ground on a day when we have just authorized a study to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars for one HemisFair in Texas in the interest of Latin American relations and now another \$37 million on a half-billion-dollar project for exactly the same operation in another southern area of the United States.

I object to this, because like Sam Houston said when he was in the Senate:

I am positive that we should not be charitable with the taxpayers' money.

Furthermore, I am not sure we will accomplish the purpose intended. When the International Bureau of Expositions—IBE—says that they cannot be interested in this long-range project, I think it is a sorry day for our taxpayers and I doubt if the Latin Americans can stand much more loving care or stand much more donations on our part, as far as their participation is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to this bill. I resent the manner in which it has been brought up for this raid on the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment, printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 30

A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Florida, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized, through such depart-

ment or agency in the executive branch of the Government as he may designate, to provide for United States participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center (hereafter in this Act referred to as "Interama"). In providing for United States participation, the President shall cooperate with the Inter-American Center Authority (an agency of the State of Florida). The purposes of Interama are—

(1) to provide a permanent international center which will serve as a meeting ground for the governments and industries of the Western Hemisphere and of other areas of the world;

(2) to facilitate broad and continuous exchanges of ideas, persons, and products through cultural, educational, and other exchanges; and

(3) by other appropriate means, to promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and to strengthen the ties which unite the United States with other nations of the free world.

Sec. 2. (a) The President is authorized, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the several States of the United States and foreign countries to take part in Interama, except that no Communist de facto government holding any people in subjugation shall be invited to participate.

(b) The department or agency in the executive branch designated by the President under the first section of this Act shall, not later than February 15, 1966, report to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed nature, extent, and cost of United States participation in Interama and the nature and extent of the participation in Interama to be anticipated on the part of foreign countries (particularly Latin American countries) and private industries.

Sec. 3. (a) There shall be in the designated department or agency a Commissioner for Interama who shall be appointed by the President and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. Subject to the direction of the head of the designated department or agency, the Commissioner for Interama shall perform such duties as the President may prescribe to carry out this Act.

(b) In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the head of the designated department or agency is authorized—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such persons as he deems necessary without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; except that no person so appointed shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for the performance of comparable duties;

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);

(3) to enter into contracts;

(4) to select, purchase, rent, construct, or otherwise acquire exhibits, including materials and equipment therefor, and to provide for the transportation, insurance, display, maintenance, and dismantling thereof;

(5) to incur such other expenses as may be necessary; and

(6) to accept donations of money, property, and services and the loan of property.

Sec. 4. The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the head of the designated department or agency with respect to determining the manner in which and the extent to which the United States shall be a participant in and an exhibitor at Interama; and

(2) to make available to the head of the designated department or agency, on a reimbursable basis, such personnel as may be necessary to assist him in carrying out his functions under this Act.

Sec. 5. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$11,000,000 to provide for United States participation in Interama under this Act, of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available for expenditure in connection with the preparation of the report required to be submitted to the Congress under section 2(b) of this Act. Sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) In addition to the amount authorized in subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,000,000 annually for each of the fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970 for the maintenance of United States installations and activities at Interama.

Mr. FASCELL (during the reading of the substitute committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute committee amendment be considered as read and printed in full in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 9, line 17, strike "\$250,000" and insert "\$125,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would not want the Floridians who are supporting this proposition to feel slighted for I offered the same amendment to the HemisFair bill. Again, I am convinced that \$125,000 is more than ample for those who will prepare and submit a report to the Congress. I do not see how they could possibly spend \$250,000. I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in saying to the Members of the House that sometime soon there ought to be some disposition in favor of a little economy in matters of this kind where economy can easily be effected. This is an excellent time and place to start.

But, Mr. Chairman, I labor under no illusion as to the probable fate of my amendment for there is no evidence that extravagance in the Federal Government is to end soon.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know of any fair or exposition that has paid itself out in his lifetime or mine? Does he know of any successful so-called international fair including the last one in New York State?

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman remarked, we have the very recent example of the New York fair which has failed to come anywhere close to paying its way.

Mr. HALL. There was the first World's Fair or International Exposition that I can remember—the one in 1933

in Chicago. That was the first one in this century and then the two in New York, in addition to the one that is going on at this time—plus the one in Fort Worth, Tex., and Seattle; and these fairs or expositions so far as I know have all been failures financially, in spite of the glowing advance predictions of what was expected and what was to happen in the future.

I support the gentleman's amendment and encourage the committee to support it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I can appreciate the feelings of my colleagues with respect to the general policy of U.S. participation in trade fairs and expositions, the facts of life are that we have long had such a national policy because we have deemed it in our national interest to participate in fairs and expositions both abroad and at home.

I would disagree most vehemently with the conclusion that those fairs and those expositions and our participation in them as a National Government has been a failure. Quite to the contrary. All the evidence is that such participation has been an outstanding success, and that there is very good reason for us to participate either on the basis of business and economics or on the basis of culture.

I would think that this is a wise policy that we have followed and that we should continue to follow it.

With respect to general authorization, that is another subject. It might very well be that at sometime in the future, this body or the other body might wish to consider general authorization with respect to U.S. participation in domestic exhibitions in the same fashion that we now have general authorization with respect to participation in international exhibitions. I think that would be a far better way to proceed. But until that decision is made and until the Department of Commerce or some other appropriate Department is given the general authority to establish the criteria, to handle applications, to pass on them, and the necessary funds to carry out the job with respect to U.S. participation in domestic fairs, we must proceed as we are doing today: on an individual basis.

This is our national practice and policy, both at the administrative level and at the congressional level. So far, it has stood us in good standing. We have reserved to ourselves, as Members of the Congress in this body, the right to review, through the authorization process and the appropriation process and by open debate on this floor, the right to review and to make the determination in each case. That has been our policy and I think it is a good policy. That is what we are doing here.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I hope my friend will speak to the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I have been and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman has been talking, I think, about the general propo-

sition. But I would like some information on why it would be expected to cost \$250,000 to make up a report that must be filed by February 15, 1966. I rather agree with the gentleman from Iowa. I am skeptical that that \$250,000 can well be spent in preparing a report.

When the amendment was offered, it struck me that it was a sensible one. I should like to have some discussion or some information indicating why it is felt that \$250,000 could properly be spent.

Mr. FASCELL. I trust the gentleman will not think I am facetious in response to his very genuine inquiry. But if we are talking in round sums, we might very well ask the question, What is the basis for the proposed \$125,000, other than an opinion, with which I do not argue? I think that the gentleman's question is a very sincere inquiry and I should attempt to reply to it.

Mr. JONAS. Did the committee have any information on which the \$250,000 figure was established? Did the committee determine how many people would be employed or engaged and what would be the extent of the investigation?

Mr. FASCELL. I am sure the gentleman knows that with the limitation we have in the bill, not to exceed \$250,000, the gentleman's appropriation committee will be able to reach its own conclusions. We do, however, have an estimate with respect to the budget breakdown of the \$250,000. I shall be glad to detail it on the record here. It is available. I shall be glad to read it to the gentleman in full right now.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. FASCELL. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I think that would be helpful to some of us. I should like to know on what basis the \$250,000 estimate was made.

Mr. FASCELL. First, it is an estimate and is subject to the appropriations process. Further, as the gentleman knows, the study may be undertaken with the help of the personnel of the executive departments, if the appropriations committee would let them do so, and in that event the actual cost may be smaller. But they cannot undertake such a study and write a report without specific authorization. That is the reason we have it in this form. That is the reason we have placed a limitation on the amount that may be spent for this purpose. As far as we are concerned, if it can be done for less, we shall be delighted to have it so done. The estimates which we have are as follows:

Planning funds expenditures

	Per year
U.S. Commissioner.....	\$20,000
Deputy Commissioner.....	17,500
Administrative assistant.....	10,000
Architectural and engineering fees....	45,000
Conceptual exhibit development.....	15,000
Office and other expenses:	
Secretarial.....	6,000
Clerical.....	10,000
Conferences and meetings.....	20,000
Contracted services.....	3,000
Rent.....	2,500
Furnishings and equipment.....	10,000
Supplies.....	3,000

Planning funds expenditures—Continued

Office and other expenses—Con.	Per year
Telephone and telegraph.....	\$4,000
Postage.....	1,200
Travel.....	30,000
Professional.....	30,000
Total.....	227,200
Plus 10 percent contingency.....	22,720
Total.....	249,920

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida, so that he may continue.

Mr. FASCELL. I might add that when one considers in the case of New York it was approximately \$300,000 and in the case of Seattle \$125,000, there can be a considerable variation in the amount. Based on the experience we have had in the past, this limitation has been fixed.

Mr. JONAS. I thought the limitation was to be made in connection with the preparation of a study which is to be filed on February 15, 1966.

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman related a number of annual salaries, including \$20,000 to one man. Are these to be on a full-year basis, or are the salaries for only 4 or 5 months, until the report is completed?

Mr. FASCELL. No; they will be continuing. The gentleman will note the language that the limitation is within the total authorization.

Mr. JONAS. But the limitation is on what can be spent for preparing the report.

Mr. FASCELL. I understand. That is a technical breakout for accounting purposes. The limitation is within the total authorization.

Mr. JONAS. I understand that.

Mr. FASCELL. The fact is there will be a U.S. Commissioner who will be a U.S. Commissioner for the entire purpose of the authorization. Technically, the breakout for the study will be for whatever would be applicable to the study.

Mr. JONAS. So it will not cost \$250,000 to make the report?

Mr. FASCELL. Obviously, it probably will not. I agree.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course there is a saving clause that "Sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

If they did not spend \$250,000, the funds would still be there to be expended.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman from Florida would want me to say, because he has already said it, that this is a limitation out of the authorization of \$11 million. The \$11 million will be available until spent. I assume they will not spend more money for preparing the report, after the report is completed and filed.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. Of course, this is subject to the appropriations process.

While I respect the gentleman who offered the amendment for his sincerity, I believe that under the circumstances it is not necessary, and I ask that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support this legislation, H.R. 30, to provide for U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla.

Interama was established as a State of Florida agency in 1951 and the purpose of the agency is to do whatever may be necessary for the establishment, construction, maintenance, operation and financing of an Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in or near Miami, Fla., as a permanent enterprise.

The character and purpose of Interama were outlined in 1951 by Dr. W. H. Walker, the first chairman of the organization, and a distinguished Floridian, who said:

The worldwide Communist drive must be met by a stronger one for truth, freedom and democracy. If communism continues to spread the next 5 years as it has the past 5, a majority of the world's population will be under Kremlin control, greatly enhancing the possibility of eventual Russian military victory. The nations of this hemisphere constitute a strong and unconquerable group if they will stand solidly together and restrain communism within their own borders. Unless the United States can solidly cement its relations with the Latin American people, it is in a poor position to do so in other far-away countries.

Interama is to be a permanent reminder of our Nation's interest in our hemisphere—a living reminder of our belief in representative government and freedom for all people. This lasting memorial to the Americas will stand as a strong example to other nations in our desire for a permanent peace and security for our area and of the world.

I am hopeful the House will act favorably on this important project, which has had the backing of the last five Presidents of the United States, the Florida congressional delegation, the Governor and cabinet of Florida, the State legislature, and the citizens of our State.

In these days of continuing crisis in Latin America we need this concrete display of the cultures of North and South America to stand not only as an example of our mutual desire for freedom, but also as a bulwark in our national defense effort.

Participation by our Government will insure the success of Interama and prove the purpose of the undertaking as outlined by Dr. Walker: meeting the Communist threat with truth, freedom and democracy through this hemispheric illustration of solidarity.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 30, which requests Federal participation in Interama.

I would like to point out my belief that this permanent international exposition will reflect favorably, not only on my State of Florida, but on the entire country in its relations with the rest of

the world. For, Interama will be the world's first living exposition and, as such, will be a showcase to which the entire Nation can look with pride.

Out of the estimated \$500 million this project will cost, Mr. Chairman, Interama seeks no more than \$11 million for the Federal exhibit. It should be emphasized that this is an investment by the Federal Government in an exhibit that will attract an estimated 75 million visitors in the first 5 years. Thousands will be visiting Interama from countries throughout the world and it is here that the United States, through its exhibit, can proudly display the American way of life to the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that a total of \$17 million was authorized for the New York World's Fair, the \$11 million asked here today for Interama—considering its permanency—is not unreasonable. Nor is it unreasonable when one considers the laudable purpose of Interama; namely, the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Republics of Latin America, and indeed the rest of the free world.

The theme of Interama is, appropriately, "Progress Through Freedom." As such, Interama will start as a living monument to the great American way of life. The Federal exhibit is an integral part of this overall imaginative program and I am hopeful, therefore, that this bill will be enacted into public law.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the proposal for an Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center as embodied in H.R. 30 should receive the support of every Member of the House.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPER], is to be congratulated for his efforts to secure the participation of the United States in what is otherwise described as Interama. With special emphasis on exhibits and a pavilion of Western Hemisphere nations it will become a permanent international exposition to portray the American way of life and will strengthen our ties with other nations of this hemisphere.

The proposal is most attractive because it is not only a permanent year round, nonprofit and a self-sustaining enterprise but also because its avowed and most worthwhile objective is to improve relations through trade with the republics of Latin America. If we can encourage exchange of goods and services between the nations of the Western Hemisphere then such an exchange will undoubtedly foster the solidarity of the American Republics.

Already an agency known as the Inter-American Center Authority has been created by the Florida Legislature and it has already obtained approval of a \$22 million dollar loan from the community facilities administration. The State of Florida, the Dade County Port Authority and others have made contributions of more than \$800,000 for studies for preliminary design and engineering data, to determine the scope and cost of the Interama program. A \$21 million bond issue has already been validated by the

circuit court of Dade County and also by the Florida Supreme Court.

Back in 1961 a 1,700 acre tract of land was acquired in northeast Dade County with appraised value in excess of \$50 million. The financial resources and commitments of Interama already approached \$150 million which proves there is substantial State, and local financial support for this project. Set off against such impressive figures there is the present request for not more than \$11 million in Federal money for the installation of exhibits and equipment of the U.S. pavilion at Interama. There is an additional authorization of an appropriation not to exceed \$1 million annually for the operation and maintenance of the U.S. exhibit at the U.S. pavilion.

This is a well-conceived project but best of all is the potential in terms of the anticipated effect of our participation with our neighbors to the south.

Mr. Speaker, I have not always been a full-time supporter of foreign aid projects and have not always been in favor of the Inter-American Development Bank but I support a project of this kind because this is the very finest way to encourage educational, scientific and other exchanges among the American Republics consistent with our commitments with the Alliance for Progress. H.R. 30 is a good bill and deserves the support of every Member of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLSEN of Montana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 582, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 112, answered “present” 1, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

Yeas—255

Adair	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Adams	Greigg	Pickle
Addabbo	Grider	Pike
Albert	Griffiths	Poage
Anderson,	Gurney	Pool
Tenn.	Hagan, Ga.	Price
Annunzio	Hagen, Calif.	Pucinski
Ashley	Halley	Parcell
Aspinall	Halpern	Quillen
Ayres	Hamilton	Randall
Bandstra	Hanley	Redlin
Beckworth	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Bennett	Hansen, Iowa	Reifel
Bingham	Hathaway	Reuss
Blatnik	Hawkins	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Hays	Rivers, S.C.
Boiland	Hebert	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Hechler	Roberts
Brooks	Helstoski	Rodino
Brown, Calif.	Horton	Rogers, Colo.
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Rogers, Fla.
Burke	Hull	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Hungate	Ronan
Burton, Calif.	Huot	Roncallo
Cabell	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Callan	Irwin	Rosenthal
Cameron	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Carey	Jarman	Roush
Casey	Joelson	Roybal
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Ryan
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	St Germain
Clevenger	Jonas	St. Onge
Cohelan	Karsten	Saylor
Collier	Karth	Scheuer
Conde	Kee	Schisler
Conyers	Kelly	Schmidhauser
Cooley	Keogh	Schweiker
Corbett	King, Calif.	Secrest
Corman	King, Utah	Selden
Craley	Kirwan	Shipley
Cramer	Kornegay	Sickles
Culver	Krebs	Sikes
Cunningham	Latta	Sisk
Curtin	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Daddario	Long, La.	Smith, Va.
Dague	Long, Md.	Staggers
Daniels	Love	Steed
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Stratton
Dawson	McDowell	Stubblefield
de la Garza	McFall	Sullivan
Delaney	McGrath	Sweeney
Dent	McMillan	Taylor
Derwinski	McVicker	Teague, Calif.
Dingell	Machen	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	Mackay	Tenzer
Dorn	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Duncan, Oreg.	Martin, Mass.	Todd
Dwyer	Mathias	Trimble
Dyal	Matsunaga	Tunney
Edmondson	Matthews	Tupper
Evans, Colo.	May	Tuten
Everett	Meeds	Udall
Farbstein	Mills	Ullman
Fasell	Minish	Van Deerlin
Feighan	Mink	Vanik
Fisher	Minshall	Vivian
Flood	Moorhead	Waggonner
Flynt	Morgan	Walker, N. Mex.
Foley	Morris	Watkins
Ford	Morrison	Watson
William D.	Morse	Watts
Fraser	Mosher	Weltner
Friedel	Moss	Whalley
Fulton, Pa.	Multer	White, Idaho
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	White, Tex.
Fuqua	Nedzi	Whitener
Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.	Widnall
Gettys	Olsen, Mont.	Willis
Gialmo	Olsen, Minn.	Wilson
Gibbons	O'Neal, Ga.	Charles H.
Gilbert	O'Neill, Mass.	Wolf
Gilligan	Ottinger	Wright
Gonzalez	Fatman	Yates
Grabowski	Pepper	Young
Gray	Perkins	Zablocki

NAYS—112

Abblitt	Baldwin	Broomfield
Abernethy	Bates	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews,	Battin	Buchanan
Glenn	Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews,	Bell	Cahill
N. Dak.	Berry	Callaway
Arends	Betts	Carter
Ashbrook	Bray	Cederberg
Ashmore	Brook	Chamberlain

Chelf	Henderson	Poff
Clancy	Hutchinson	Quile
Clawson, Del.	Jennings	Race
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Reid, Ill.
Conable	Kastenmeier	Reinecke
Curtis	Keith	Rhodes, Ariz.
Davis, Wis.	King, N.Y.	Robison
Deyne	Kunkel	Rooney, N.Y.
Dickinson	Laird	Roudebush
Dole	Langen	Rumsfeld
Downing	Lennon	Satterfield
Duncan, Tenn.	Lipscomb	Schneebell
Edwards, Ala.	McClary	Shriver
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Skubitz
Erlenborn	McDade	Slack
Findley	MacGregor	Smith, Calif.
Fountain	Mackie	Stafford
Gathings	Mahon	Stalbaum
Goodell	Marsh	Stanton
Green, Oreg.	Martin, Nebr.	Talcott
Griffin	Michel	Tuck
Gross	Mize	Utt
Grover	Moore	Vigorito
Gusber	Natcher	Walker, Miss.
Hall	Nelsen	Williams
Hardy	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Harsha	Patten	Wyatt
Harvey, Ind.	Pelly	Wylder
Harvey, Mich.	Pirnie	Younger

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Dow

NOT VOTING—64

Anderson, Ill.	Fino	Miller
Andrews,	Fogarty	Moeller
George W.	Ford, Gerald R.	Monagan
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Morton
Barrett	Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Halleck	Murray
Bolton	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Bonner	Hansen, Wash.	O'Brien
Bow	Harris	O'Hara, Ill.
Burton, Utah	Herlong	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks	Powell
Clausen,	Holifield	Resnick
Don H.	Holland	Roosevelt
Colmer	Hosmer	Scott
Denton	Johnson, Okla.	Senner
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Smith, N.Y.
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Springer
Edwards, Calif.	Landrum	Stephens
Evins, Tenn.	Lindsay	Thomas
Fallon	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Farnley	Macdonald	Toil
Farnum	Martin, Ala.	Whitten

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Passman with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Farnley with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
 Mr. Powell with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Herlong.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Senner.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Denton.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Farnum with Mr. Harris.
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. DOW changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin and Mr. LANGEN changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills H.R. 9247 and H.R. 30, both of which were just passed by the House, during the general debate on both of those bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MONEY SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the old adage that “money speaks louder than words,” may have been an important underlying factor in what appears to be a more reasonable attitude on the part of Pakistan and India in resolving their differences over Kashmir. Buried beneath this morning's headlines concerning a possible cease-fire, was an announcement by the World Bank that it had postponed indefinitely a meeting scheduled for tomorrow of nine Western nations that were supposed to pledge contributions to finance the first year of a new Pakistani 5-year plan for economic development.

The World Bank said the session could not be held at present because of the “abnormal conditions in the subcontinent. A meeting will be convened as soon as circumstances permit,” a spokesman said.

Pakistan was seeking the equivalent of \$500 million for the first year of its third 5-year plan. Currently, World Bank economic assistance to India amounts to approximately \$1 billion per year.

As the ranking Minority Member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which has under its jurisdiction both the World Bank and the International Development Association, I want to take this opportunity to commend the World Bank for this timely action.

The threat to postpone massive economic assistance to recipient nations involved in costly wars can be a very real deterrent to those who threaten world peace. I would personally recommend that any and all World Bank meetings leading to new economic commitments be postponed until the Kashmir question is settled.

Moreover, under the anti-aggression amendment to the Foreign Assistance

Act of 1963, the President has the authority to cut off all unilateral U.S. economic aid to India and Pakistan at any time he deems desirable.

Mr. Speaker, the threat to cut off or postpone large-scale World Bank economic aid to these two countries may very well turn out to have been the single most important factor in bringing about a cease-fire.

AMERICA'S DWINDLING WATER SUPPLY

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, many Members have taken notice of America's dwindling water supply. Various legislation has been passed this year, or is presently under consideration, which would assist in the alleviation of the water supply problem—on a long-range basis.

None of these proposals or programs will solve the problem next week or at any time in the immediate future.

Something must be done now—to alert the American public to the gravity of the situation and to point out to all of our citizens various ways through which they, in their own homes and on their own jobs, can help their country in what is rapidly becoming a desperate situation.

For this reason, I am introducing today a joint resolution authorizing and requesting that the President designate November, as National Water Conservation Month in recognition of the importance of water conservation to the maintenance of public health and the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have notified the President of my proposal and I hope to have his support in this worthwhile endeavor. I hope also to have support of all Members of this House.

HUGH LAWSON WHITE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi today mourn the loss of one of her most productive and illustrious sons. Hugh Lawson White, twice Governor of Mississippi, quietly passed away September 19, in Jackson, at the age of 84.

Governor White contributed to his fellow man at every step in his busy life. His energetic devotion to economic progress was the main theme of his being. Even during the closing chapter of his life, Governor White tirelessly boosted his State, inspired its people, and expressed faith in its future. His monuments are of his own erection. The din surrounding the industrial worker will echo into history as a tribute to the balance agriculture with industry pro-

gram which was conceived, nurtured, and ripened by the intellect of Hugh White.

Loved and respected by all who knew him, Governor White's towering strength will be irreplaceable in the hearts and minds of his friends. The world is a better place because he passed our way.

I ask consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article on the death of Governor White which appeared in the McComb, Miss., Enterprise Journal on September 20, 1965. It follows:

Gov. HUGH WHITE MOURNED AT 84—STATE, CITY LOSE A FAVORITE SON
(By Charles B. Gordon)

McComb's proudest native son who became Governor of Mississippi on two separate occasions, died at his home in Jackson early Monday at the age of 84.

Hugh Lawson White, son of the late Captain and Mrs. John J. White of McComb, succumbed peacefully to a heart attack brought on by his advanced age, relatives said.

Mississippi officials issued formal announcements of his death early today, then ordered that flags at the capitol, which he graced in two notably successful terms as Governor, be lowered at half mast.

FUNERAL PLANS

Governor White's body was scheduled to lie in state at the new capitol from 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. today. Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Tuesday at one of Jackson's Baptist churches.

The body will be brought to McComb to J. J. White Memorial Presbyterian Church for final services set for 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Burial will take place in the family mausoleum in Hollywood Cemetery by the side of his illustrious parents and his first wife, who died 5 years ago last May 13.

Governor White's death came 1 week after this grateful community tendered him a "Hugh White Day," which he attended and enjoyed to the fullest.

HISTORIC FAMILY

Governor White was born here August 19, 1831, a son of Capt. J. J. and Helen Tyree White who had settled near Summit and operated a sawmill after Captain White completed his long tour of duty as a Confederate soldier.

Not long after McComb came into official existence in 1872, Captain White moved his mill and his family to what is now the Whitestown community of McComb.

The venerable rebel and his wife had three sons—Will, John J., and Hugh L.—all now deceased. Will White made his home at Pass Christian, and J. J. White, Jr., operated a laundry and other businesses in McComb until his death about 15 years ago.

White attended the University of Mississippi after his graduation from the McComb schools. He did not graduate but returned to the city to enter the family lumber business.

ADVANCED SWIFTLY

He swiftly gained a place of stature in the area's business and banking life that foretold of the immensity of his economic future and his productive work for his State.

When the pine forests of this immediate community reached a point of decline that made the move necessary, he moved the lumber business to Columbia, where he attained new heights of success over many fine years.

He had married Miss Judith Sugg, who came from Providence, Ky., to teach piano in McComb Female College, later a part of Belhaven College at Jackson.

The Whites had no children. After her death he married the former Miss Maxine Maxwell, who survives as the widow.

FEW RELATIVES

Of the immediate White family, only the following nieces and nephews survive:

Mrs. Helen White Brumfield, McComb; Hugh Johnson, Mrs. D. A. Ratliff and Mrs.

Howard Rankin, Columbia, and Mrs. George Evans, Jackson.

He served as mayor of Columbia on three different occasions, then fixed his sights on State office. He was elected Governor in 1936 and fostered the now famous balance agriculture with industry program. The project sought to equalize the industrial work force with the traditional agriculture.

SECOND TERM

He was elected to a second term as Governor in 1952-56 and sandwiched a term in the State legislature during 1944-48.

Among his many philanthropies is the church in McComb that is a memorial to his father and a \$50,000 contribution to Belhaven College for a new dormitory as a memorial to his mother.

WEDS AGAIN

In April 1962, he honeymooned with his 40-year-old bride in New Orleans.

"It's the condition, the attitude, and the health of the man that make the difference," he said in an interview.

"Who knows? She may be too old for me," said White with a smile.

"He may be right," his bride said. "I have a hard time keeping up with him and the busy schedule he keeps."

LOVED PROGRESS

"I'm not as interested in holding a political job as I am in seeing the State move forward," he said.

This philosophy pushed the State ahead at a pace that has been unequaled.

White was a true southern gentleman who was seldom seen without a coat and a rose in his label.

"I want to see at least one industry in every one of the 82 counties," White said. "I'll work for Mississippi just as long as I have breath to travel."

SHARING OF FEDERAL REVENUES

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, speaking before the New York State County Officers Association in New York City, proposed a thoughtful and workable plan for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with the States. Our States need additional funds if they are to institute and maintain vital programs—particularly in education and health. I intend to cosponsor the Javits bill in the House of Representatives so that serious discussion and debate on this proposal can begin now.

A Federal-State tax revenue sharing plan was first suggested several years ago, yet there has been little serious discussion of the merits and certainly no concrete action on the proposal since that time.

The need for remission of certain Federal tax moneys to the States and localities is increasingly clear. Property taxes on which much of education depends have risen about as high as they can go, yet the cost of education and other needed services and facilities continues to rise at a rapid rate.

Senator JAVITS has proposed a necessary and feasible piece of legislation.

Under his proposal, 1 percent of the current income tax base would be deposited in a trust fund. Eighty percent of this fund would then be allocated to the States, on the basis of population. State efforts to raise their own revenue would not be discouraged, however, because State shares would be increased or decreased depending on the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State compared to the national average ratio. The remaining 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with the lowest per capita incomes.

States could use these moneys only for programs that would benefit directly the greatest number of people in the State—such as in the fields of health and education. Equitable sharing by States with local governments would also be insured.

I am pleased to join with the distinguished senior Senator from New York in sponsoring legislation along these lines and I compliment him on his initiative.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a descriptive article on Senator JAVITS' bill as well as an excellent editorial commending his suggestion. I ask unanimous consent to insert these two articles at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

JAVITS BREAKS THROUGH

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS deserves a burst of applause for introducing a bill that would provide for the sharing of surplus Federal revenues with the States. The prospect for tax legislation sponsored by a member of the minority party cannot be regarded as auspicious. But Mr. JAVITS is performing the necessary task of bringing a controversial proposal to the attention of Congress for the first time.

Mr. JAVITS' point of departure has already been amply discussed by proponents of revenue sharing. The Federal Government, under conditions of high employment, will collect more tax moneys than it can wisely spend. The State and local governments will be spending more money than they can raise through efficient measures of taxation. Both problems—the embarrassing affluence of the Federal Government and the pressing needs of State and local governments—can be neatly solved through a program of Federal revenue sharing.

In the Senator's thoughtful proposal, 1 percent of the current income tax base—about \$2.5 billion—would be deposited in a trust fund. The proceeds of the fund would then be allocated to the States. Each year 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population and 20 percent would be divided among the 12 or 15 States with lowest per capita incomes.

The Federal grants would be used only to support programs in the fields of health, education, and welfare. This constraint would leave the States and localities ample freedom of action, while precluding the support of programs such as highway construction that are already heavily funded by the Congress.

The revenue sharing plan was first proposed by Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. But the President, seemingly piqued by a premature leak, has maintained an air of chilly disdain. It would be ironic indeed if this important proposal, the brainchild of a Democrat, should become the property of the opposition.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

UNITED STATES-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN REVIVED BY JAVITS (By Frank Porter)

A leading Republican Senator plucked a controversial Federal-State revenue-sharing plan off the administration's back burner yesterday and said he will offer it as legislation before the end of the current session.

"I think it is now generally agreed that some form of Federal assistance to State and local government is necessary but there has been a lack of serious discussion," said Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York.

"Debate should begin, and decisions should be made on a tax-sharing plan before State and local governments become completely inundated in the flood of demands for new services and facilities, particularly in the fields of health, education, and welfare," JAVITS told the New York State County Officers Association in New York City.

JAVITS thereby stole a march on the White House itself, which put the plan under wraps last fall after its leaked details aroused intense opposition, particularly in labor and liberal circles.

Since then, however, it has attracted widespread grassroots interest, particularly among State and local officials feeling a financial pinch.

Republicans have made political capital of it. During last fall's presidential campaign, even Barry Goldwater embraced the concept, fathered 5 years ago by Walter W. Heller shortly before he became President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. It was a prime topic of discussion at the Republican Governors conference earlier this year.

But the administration is apparently unmoved by the Javits initiative. A White House source said last night that the revenue-sharing plan is a "dead duck" and that there is no present intention of reviving it.

The Javits bill would follow closely the Heller concept as developed last year by a Presidential task force headed by Joseph A. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. The White House has never released the Pechman report.

The carefully drawn measure also contains a number of safeguards and limitations which should go far to conciliate both conservative and liberal critics.

It would create a special trust fund of 1 percent of the individual income tax base—or about \$2.5 billion annually under present conditions.

Eighty percent of these funds would be allocated to the States in proportion to their population. To maintain State efforts to raise their own revenue, however, these amounts would be increased or diminished by the amount the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income in the State exceeded or lagged the national ratio.

The other 20 percent would be distributed to the 12 or 15 States with the lowest per capita incomes.

The funds could be used only for health, education, and welfare to benefit directly the greatest number of people in a State. Earlier critics had opposed a no-strings-type distribution on grounds the funds might be misused—say for an ornate Governor's mansion, or for highways at the expense of education.

The bill also would require an audit of how the funds are used, the equitable sharing of funds by the States with local governments, and certification that projects financed by these revenues comply with all Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether the majority leader has cleared this with the minority leader?

Mr. ALBERT. I have cleared this with the Republican whip, the acting minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this matter has been cleared with the minority whip.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUGAR ACT A HEAVY BURDEN ON CONSUMERS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 11135) proposing a 5-year extension of the Sugar Act, reported by the Committee on Agriculture, is in direct conflict with avowed U.S. objectives in foreign trade.

Acting under authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, U.S. negotiators at Geneva are striving for lower trade barriers so as to promote a freer movement of commerce among nations. The objective of the Trade Expansion Act was to eliminate or reduce quotas and other restrictive devices imposed by other nations which have the effect of discriminating against American products.

We could examine more easily and accurately the mote in the eye of others if we would first remove the beam from our own.

The Sugar Act is a good place to start.

Of all American schemes to rig markets and control production—and we have them in embarrassing abundance—this one should qualify as the prototype for complexity, extent of Government power and absence of competitive conditions. It makes the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute czar of sugar. Not one pound can move legally without his authority.

The act has several purposes:

First. To protect domestic producers. The tropics are best suited to sugar production, and because of this, little or no sugar would be produced in the United States were it not for protection. Under the Sugar Act, approximately 60 percent of the sugar we use is produced domestically.

Second. To assure dependable supplies. Foreign countries providing us with the other 40 percent of our require-

ments are guaranteed premium prices. Because U.S. prices are higher, dependable supplies are assured.

Third. To stabilize prices at reasonable levels. Under successive Sugar Acts, prices have relatively remained stable.

This should not be surprising. If Government controlled the supply of shoes the same as sugar, the American consumer could be assured stable shoe prices. But \$15 shoes would probably be selling for \$25. Prices which are pegged high and kept there by tight Government controls are naturally very stable.

Whether these stable prices are reasonable is open to question. If the American homemaker were confronted with the choice between Canada-priced sugar—currently about 8 cents a pound on the grocery shelf—and U.S.-priced sugar—about 11 cents—she would quickly identify the Canadian item as reasonable and the U.S. item as not. As a practical matter she has no such choice.

HOW THE PROGRAM OPERATES

Currently, the world price of raw sugar is about \$2 a hundredweight. The comparable U.S. price is about \$5.50. These figures are adjusted for transportation and the tariff fee of 62 cents per hundredweight, which applies to all imports except those from the Philippines. Under a treaty agreement, the Philippine sugar tariff is on a graduated scale which will not reach the full amount imposed on other countries until 1975.

The inflated U.S. price is achieved and maintained through supply control which is completely in charge of the Secretary of Agriculture. By controlling all marketings and imports, he forces prices to the desired artificial level and keeps them there.

Congress specifies what countries will share in the foreign quotas, how big a piece each will get and who will share in the fill-in business when—due to the weather or other factors—countries do not meet their quotas.

The U.S. part of the pie is also controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture. Production is controlled through Federal licensing of mills. Each mill contracts for supplies from individual farmers. Authority for acreage allotments is also in the act, as a secondary means of production control.

U.S. farmers benefit from two forms of Government action. They produce for the artificially high market price. They also get the advantage of direct payments.

These payments are graduated, depending on the size of the farm. They range from 30 cents per hundredweight for the big farms to 80 cents for the smallest.

To illustrate the magnitude of these payments to some individual company-farmers, here are the 25 highest payments for the 1963 crop:

U.S. Sugar Corp., Florida: \$1,104,613.05.

Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$1,074,520.77.

Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$574,552.89.

C. Brewer Puerto Rico, Inc., Puerto Rico: \$569,233.42.

Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$559,892.84.

Waialua Ag. Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$549,392.78.

Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Florida: \$548,282.33.

Luce & Co., Puerto Rico: \$539,645.20.

Ewa Plantation Co., Hawaii: \$460,721.35.

Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$444,611.23.

Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$399,285.52.

Grove Farm Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$368,795.14.

Pepeekeo Sugar Co., Hawaii: \$362,866.55.

Hawaiian Ag. Co., Hawaii: \$359,090.02.

South Coast Corp., Louisiana: \$356,593.10.

Antonio Roig Sucrs. S. en C., Puerto Rico: \$346,517.03.

Laupahoehoe Sugar Co., Hawaii: \$344,705.63.

Kohala Sugar Co., Hawaii: \$322,175.94.

Olokele Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$312,628.01.

Puna Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$298,803.48.

Wailuku Sugar Co., Hawaii: \$296,631.39.

McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$294,161.87.

Hutchinson Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: \$287,647.39.

Suc J. Serralles, Puerto Rico: \$273,404.51.

Onomea Sugar Co., Hawaii: \$268,893.31.

Because of these direct payments—and the 62 cent tariff—raw sugar produced locally is about \$1.20 per hundredweight more costly than sugar imported under quotas from foreign producers. It is about \$4.70 higher than the price at which sugar presently moves in world markets.

COST OF PROGRAM

It is apparent from this that the Sugar Act is very costly for U.S. consumers. For example, the shelf price of sugar in Canada recently was 8 cents a pound compared with 11 cents in the United States. Canada is within a British-protected market and prices below 8 cents can be found elsewhere in the world.

At present prices, the value of the "quota premium"—approximately the difference between the world price and the U.S. price of raw sugar—is about \$3.50, or \$70 a ton. If the United States consumes 10 million tons as expected during the next year, this means the Sugar Act will impose a burden of at least \$700 million on U.S. consumers.

Of the 10 million tons, about 4 million will be purchased under foreign quotas. Thus, the "quota premium" for the foreign part alone is about \$280 million.

This bill will authorize the program for 5 years. If prices average out at present levels for the 5 years, this legislation will put a burden of about \$3.5 billion on consumers for the whole package, or \$1.4 billion for the foreign aid part alone.

A proper evaluation of the program's cost must of course give consideration to the importance to the U.S. economy of domestic sugar production. The domes-

tic part gives livelihood to many tax-paying U.S. citizens. Some argue that domestic sugar production is important from the standpoint of national security.

The question is where and how the line is drawn. In my view, this legislation puts the line far beyond the limits of reason.

A substantial amount of domestic production can be protected at far less cost through a simple tariff pegged at \$2 per hundredweight.

Dependable additional supplies could be assured through private contractual arrangements—as they are in the case of many raw materials—without the tight Government controls embodied in this program.

Even if the Government-control approach is retained, dependable supplies could be assured at a premium price far below the present one.

The price paid to foreign suppliers is presently nearly three times the world price.

This is profiteering on a grand scale, and the consumers are forced to pick up the tab. The Federal Trade Commission and other agencies which are intended to protect the public interest are powerless to act in this case, because the profiteering is not only sanctioned, but promoted and carried out by the Government itself.

INFLUENCE OF LOBBYISTS

Because this legislation is such a sugary plum for foreigners lucky enough to get a piece, lobbying has developed to an extraordinary level.

I was unable to question lobbyists who appeared before the committee concerning their fees and services performed—see page 203 of the hearings on H.R. 10496—but I was able to secure the desired information from the Foreign Agents Registrations Section of the Justice Department, where filing by these lobbyists is required every 6 months.

The fees range from relatively modest retainers of \$3,000 a year—two lobbyists fall in that range—to \$50,000 a year—two at this level—several in the \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year rung, and others in between—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 24, 1965, page 21611, for details.

Most of the lobbyists either represent foreign governments directly or Government-controlled sugar enterprises.

Public money—and only public money—is involved. The lobbyists have one clear objective: to get as much of the sugar pie as possible. In effect, their fees are covered by the American taxpayers and consumers, because the sugar program—which is completely under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture—makes possible the sugary premium prices for foreign countries lucky enough to get quotas.

Lobbying in behalf of sugar legislation appears to me to be more costly and more extensive than that in behalf of any other legislation on Capitol Hill. I have made several inquiries and have learned of no other legislation which has called forth as witnesses such an impressive string of well-paid private attorneys representing foreign governments. For that matter, private attorneys representing foreign government are unknown as witnesses before the Foreign Affairs

Committee, which sets the guidelines for foreign-aid programs even more extensive than the Sugar Act.

The Sugar Act touches intimately on foreign policy. Undoubtedly it has influenced tremendously the economic development of many small countries. Cuba, for example, once had a diversified agriculture. Preferential treatment which Cuba for many years received from the United States on sugar quotas eventually shifted Cuba to a one-crop economy. Sugar quotas undoubtedly

have figured in the rise and fall of several Latin American governments. Like it or not, the Sugar Act has built into it the seeds of war and peace.

Sugar quotas caused rioting in Argentina in 1962. Whether the committee action this year reducing to one-third the quota sought by the administration for Argentina will cause trouble again remains to be seen. Certainly the Peronistas are strong in sugar areas of Argentina. Our Sugar Act clearly has great impact on foreign affairs.

Some of the fees of sugar lobbyists are shockingly high. They are so high they raise questions. For example, what do the clients get for the money? How does an attorney justify a fee of \$50,000 a year? Maybe he does things and performs services that do not readily come to mind, but it appears that most of them are overpaid. But would foreign countries continue year after year to overpay them? The lobbyists should have the opportunity to explain why they get so much.

TABLE I.—Information on sugar lobbyists

Name of attorney and firm	Client's name	Compensation for most recent 12-month period reported
Attorney Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Bldg., Washington, D.C.	Venezuelan Sugar Distributing Association	\$50,000.00
Attorney Oscar L. Chapman of Chapman & Friedman, Pennsylvania Bldg., Washington, D.C.	National Union of Sugar Producers of Mexico	50,000.00
Mr. Albert S. Nemir, A. S. Nemir Associates, 1016-1022 Warner Bldg., Washington, D.C.	Brazilian Sugar & Alcohol Institute	31,511.06
Attorney Arthur L. Quinn of Quinn & Quinn, 1625 K St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Privately owned sugar companies in British West Indies, Ecuador, Panama, and British Honduras.	25,000.00
Attorney Sheldon Z. Kaplan of Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Representing Latin American Sugar Council, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Costa Rica.	24,800.00
Attorney Charles H. Brown, 1705 DeSales St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Fiji	24,000.00
Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Bldg., Washington, D.C.	Indian Sugar Mills Association	20,000.00
Attorney John R. Mahoney of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.	South African Sugar Association	19,320.08
Attorney Robert C. Barnard of Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 52 Wall St., New York, N.Y.	Colonial Sugar Refinery, Sydney, Australia	19,175.12
Attorney John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.	Philippine Sugar Association and the National Federation of Sugar-cane Planters of the Philippines.	18,000.00
Attorney Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Sugar Producers Committee of Peru	15,000.00
Attorney Ernest Schein and John G. Laylin, 815 15th St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Associated Sugar Producers of Colombia	15,000.00
Attorney James M. Earnest, 1000 Woodward Bldg., Washington, D.C.	Mauritius Chamber of Agriculture and the Mauritius Sugar Syndicate	13,952.00
Attorney Walter Sterling Surrey of Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Bldg., Washington, D.C.	Sugar Producers of Guadeloupe and Martinique	12,500.00
Attorney Seymour S. Guthman, Woodward Bldg., suite 200, Washington, D.C.	Sugar Producers of the Madagascar Republic	7,500.00
Attorney Ganson Purcell, partner in firm of Purcell & Nelson, 888 17th St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Southern Rhodesia Sugar Sales, Ltd.	5,000.00
Attorney George M. Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.	Thailand	3,500.00
Attorney Robert L. Farrington, 1155 15th St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Republic of China	3,000.00
Attorney Robert D. Larsen of Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K St. NW., Washington, D.C.	Swaziland Sugar Association	(1)

1 Filed Aug. 2, 1965 (nothing received up to time of filing).

TABLE II.—Comparison of foreign sugar quotas for nations other than the Philippine Islands under H.R. 11135 and administration proposal at 9,700,000 tons annual U.S. consumption

(Short tons, raw value)

Country	H.R. 11135 as reported by House Agriculture Committee	H.R. 10496 as recommended by the administration
(A) Countries in the Western Hemisphere:		
Mexico	340,925	390,135
Dominican Republic	340,925	385,854
Brazil	340,925	221,558
Peru	272,013	240,824
British West Indies	150,397	122,017
Ecuador	50,267	49,770
French West Indies	42,970	50,841
Colombia	42,970	27,829
Costa Rica	42,159	34,786
Nicaragua	38,511	40,672
Guatemala	32,896	35,321
Venezuela	30,809	2,676
El Salvador	30,403	17,125
Haiti	28,782	18,731
Panama	25,134	18,449
Argentina	21,855	63,685
British Honduras	19,864	4,281
Bolivia	4,054	None
Honduras	4,054	None
(B) Countries outside the Western Hemisphere:		
Australia	162,152	186,772
Republic of China	67,293	67,431
India	64,861	96,865
South Africa	29,593	96,865
Fiji	24,323	45,489
Thailand	19,864	None
Mauritius	14,188	14,985
Swaziland	6,081	9,098
Southern Rhodesia	6,081	9,098
Malagasy Republic	6,081	7,492
Total	2,260,000	2,260,000

How effective are the lobbyists in getting what they want? The results are mixed.

One of them was given credit by the chairman of this committee for rallying a foreign-producer protest of sufficient magnitude that the Johnson administration dropped plans to recommend a "recapture" arrangement which, at present prices, would have enriched the U.S. Treasury by \$80 million a year. See page 182 of the hearings on H.R. 10496.

The "recapture" proposal had been recommended earlier this year by the "Sugar Industry," a group of U.S. firms interested in sugar production and processing. Included were the Domestic Beet Sugar Industry, Mainland Cane Sugar Industry, Hawaiian Sugar Industry, Puerto Rican Sugar Industry, and the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association. At the request of the administration, this group made proposals for Sugar Act revision. The "recapture" proposal was included in them.

It would have established next year an import fee on foreign sugar which would be 1 cent per pound or one-half the difference between the U.S. price objective and the world raw sugar price—whichever is less.

Under present prices, the 1-cent provision would operate, and it would yield about \$80 million a year.

In a statement March 29, the "Sugar Industry" said the import fee would "tend

to discourage overexpansion of world sugar production and tend to facilitate achievement of price objectives of the act."

This provision—worth \$80 million a year to U.S. taxpayers—was dropped. In committee I offered an amendment to restore the import fee. My amendment was defeated.

Philippine sugar interests seem to be well represented.

Under a longstanding treaty, the Philippines get a basic quota of 980,000 tons and, as mentioned before, a sliding scale on the tariff. In the present legislation, the Philippines get an extra quota of 70,000 tons annually. In addition, they get 10.86 percent of all increase in sugar consumption starting at the level of 9.7 million tons. This will yield an additional quota of about 30,000 tons the first year of this legislation.

A tidbit in H.R. 10496 gave the Philippines 47.22 percent of any deficit which occurs in domestic quota production. Based on past performance, this will yield the Philippines an additional 150,000 tons a year.

But this was not enough.

After the Philippines examined the language of the bill, they complained that the Philippines were not given 47.22 percent of deficits which might occur in all foreign quotas too.

The result was a new sugar bill, H.R. 11135, introduced the day after the committee had thought it had taken final

action reporting the bill. It gives the Philippines 47.22 percent of all quota deficits, foreign and domestic except for the 6 Central American common market countries.

In both versions, the Philippines get an increase of more than 3,000 tons in a special category called direct-consumption. This sugar is refined, not raw. The Philippines is one of two countries enjoying this special privilege and the only one getting an increase.

Not all countries which had lobbyists got increased quotas, but each of the nine countries which got quotas for the first time this year had lobbyists. Argentina did not hire a lobbyist, reportedly because it thought it was not the thing to do. The Argentina quota is cut to about one-third the level recommended by the administration.

STUDY IS NEEDED

A thorough study of sugar is needed. Many questions need answers. Among them are these:

What price advantage is needed to assure dependable supplies from foreign producers?

To what extent, if at all, were the sugar price increases in 1963-64 caused by the global quotas imposed by the 1962 act?

Does the domestic program keep inefficient producers in business and thus bring excessive profits to the efficient producers, and if so to what extent?

What effect does the program have on economic and political developments in quota countries?

Do foreign governments actually get the foreign-aid component of U.S. sugar prices, or does it simply enrich private firms?

What level of domestic sugar production is required by national security considerations?

A proposal was recently made for the study of sugar legislation by the Joint Economic Committee to determine its economic impact. The Congress might profit from a study of this program by the Tariff Commission, or by the staff of Ways and Means Committee which has an extensive background in tariff and quota matters. Curiously, the Ways and Means Committee is completely bypassed, although the legislation intimately involves tariff and other revenue.

WAYS BILL COULD BE IMPROVED

The most-needed improvement is reduction of the bill's foreign-aid component. A quota premium worth more than the world market price of raw sugar is nonsense. It is not needed to assure dependable supplies.

One way to cut is to restore the import fee which the Kennedy administration proposed but the Johnson administration later dropped. This would cut the foreign-aid component from about \$280 million a year, to about \$200 million.

Another approach would be to increase the sugar tariff from its present level of 62 cents per hundredweight to \$2. This would transfer over \$100 million of the foreign-aid gravy to the U.S. Treasury.

Still another possibility would be to reduce U.S. sugar prices. This probably would force out some of the less efficient domestic producers.

The best improvement would be to drop the act entirely, and rely on a simple tariff to give desired domestic protection. The tariff approach would end Government rule of sugar. All foreign producers would have fair and equal access to the U.S. market. All domestic farmers would have fair and equal opportunity to compete for tariff-protected business.

To provide time for an objective study of the Sugar Act, the Congress would be wise to deal at this time only with stop-gap legislation needed to meet marketing problems of domestic producers, and leave the foreign-quota problem to next year.

COMMERCIAL JETS NEEDED IN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, nearly every Member of Congress is vitally concerned with air transportation, and particularly air safety as well as public convenience and necessity. My remarks today have to do with an apparent policy by the Federal Aviation Agency denying commercial airlines the permission to fly jet equipment in or out of Washington National Airport.

The Washington Post treated this subject in some detail in the Sunday, September 19 paper:

JETS ARE BOUND TO SWISH IF NATIONAL IS TO SURVIVE

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

The pace of technology and the demands of competition have taken the "whether" out of the dispute over jet airplanes at National Airport and replaced it with a "when."

Either jets will be flying regularly in and out of National in a few years or the airport will have begun to shrink toward nonexistence.

Small, short-haul jets are arriving faster than anyone expected a few years ago and their planned use on short flights by one line has forced all other major carriers to prepare for the day when they will fly only jets and turboprop planes.

Some airline officials expect that day to come by the end of 1967. The Federal Aviation Agency, of course, is conducting another in a long series of studies and will not change its present opposition to jets at National at least until it is completed. But G. Ward Hobbs, director of the FAA's Bureau of National Airports, says "jets can't help but be an eventuality" at National.

The reason there were no jets allowed at National when they first went into general service in the mid-1950's was, of course, that they were too big, too fast, too heavy and made too much noise.

But jets are changing with the times, and the original arguments against their use at National no longer seem as pertinent.

NATIONAL'S PROBLEM

Hobbs explained that the study will try to predict what jet use of National would do to traffic volume and economics there, at Dulles International Airport at Chantilly, Va., and at Baltimore's Friendship International Airport. The FAA also is checking

National's physical capacity for jets and the effects of jet engine noise on the inner-city area.

From the beginning, National's runways were too short and not nearly strong enough for the big jetliners. All suggestions for adapting National to accommodate them were rejected for "lack of feasibility" and the fear of excessive noise and air traffic congestion.

Instead, Dulles was planned as Washington's "jet port," to be tailor made for jetliners and located too far from the city to worry about noise or other interference.

UPSET LOGIC

But since the opening of Dulles, several unexpected trends in air travel have, in the opinion of most of the air carrier industry, upset the original logic for restricting National to piston-driven aircraft.

Passenger jets are no longer all big four-engine craft that eat up a mile or more of runway on takeoff and landing and suitable only for long-distance hauls. Already introduced into regular service are the three-engined Boeing 727 and the twin-jet French Caravelle, suited for 1,000-mile flights and adaptable to shorter landing strips.

But the planes expected to make piston-driven craft obsolete for scheduled passenger flight are the three newest small jets, the Douglas DC-9, the Boeing 737 and the English BAC-111.

Airline officials say these planes vastly outperform piston-driven airliners on even the shortest runs. They fly faster, carry more passengers, require less maintenance, need only about the same amount of runway and, the airlines claim, are much more quiet than bigger jets. According to the Air Transport Association, to which all the airlines belong, the new small jets will be twice as efficient as propeller planes for both the airlines and the passenger.

More than 340 of the small jets are now on order. The first will be put into service next month and the last ones now on order will be flying by the end of 1966. Already, 500 piston-driven airliners have been replaced by larger jets and turboprops, propellers run by a jet engine (jets flew 73 percent of the passenger miles last year), and the rest, still used for short flights and the east coast shuttle, are expected to be shoved aside by the small jets within 18 months.

The carriers already have slowed piston-plane phaseout on medium-range routes to the Midwest because of National's jet ban and what they feel is still too great a distance from downtown Washington to Dulles for any but long-distance flight passengers.

FRESH LOOK

But the airlines believe that the development of the small jets, and possibly the recent change in FAA administrators, has spurred the agency into taking a fresh look at admitting jets to National.

FAA spokesmen agreed that the study was designed as a "fresh look," but pointed out that the study was begun before the previous administrator, Najeeb E. Halaby, retired in July and was replaced by Gen. William McKee.

The major roadblocks to a change of FAA policy—uncertainty about National's capacity for jets, the effects on Dulles and Friendship and the persistent noise fear—still exist.

Hobbs has said that the parking and taxi airstrips at National, where the runways were overhauled and relighted just a year ago, would have to be strengthened to support even the smaller jet safely. He added that traffic programs would have to be solved and that longer runways may be necessary.

Congress has been the source of concern about Dulles and Friendship. The Maryland delegation, led by Representative CLARENCE D. LONG, Democrat, of Ruxton, near Baltimore, has argued that opening National to jet traffic would severely cut into Friendship's

current short- and medium-range jetliner business, and limit its future expansion. In 1964, 6 million passengers used National, 1.4 million used Friendship and 800,000 used Dulles.

Other Congressmen who bitterly opposed Dulles, and its \$110 million price tag, from its inception, now are fighting to keep jets out of National on the grounds that if Dulles was built for jets, that is where they all should go. Besides, they add, Dulles, 27 miles from downtown, already is badly lacking business and losing money, without having some of its current jet trade diverted to convenient National.

The noise issue has been raised mostly by residents of the Virginia suburbs near National. Some Congressmen also have voiced concern about jet noise in the Federal City area.

LAGUARDIA DID IT

On the other side, Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, told the Senate Aviation Subcommittee recently. "There are no technical or operational obstacles standing in the way of opening the airport to small airline jets tomorrow."

Other airport spokesmen point to tests of the Boeing 727 at LaGuardia Airport, located in the heart of New York City, where the medium-sized jet needed less than half the length of National's longest runway to take off and land. LaGuardia, which also had banned jets for many years, now is used by the 727 and similar jets.

They say only small and medium-sized jets are needed for National's type of business—primarily short-to-medium-length flights up and down the east coast and to the Midwest.

They do not think jet traffic at National would pose any threat to the intercontinental and cross-country business that Dulles handles, although Friendship might be expected to lose some traffic. "But the way things are going," one airline official said, "no airport anywhere will soon suffer for lack of business, anyway."

He added that the noise caused by small jets is no louder than that of piston-engine planes, and that it actually should cause less concern because, on take off, jet craft can climb more quickly to higher altitudes.

The airlines also will need fewer small jets to carry the same number of passengers now using National, their officials argue, so that even with increased business there, traffic congestion should not grow alarmingly.

The airlines also have their supporters in Congress, notably the chairmen of the House and Senate Commerce Committees, Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator WARREN C. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington.

"I believe the time has arrived, if it has not already passed, when we should expect jet air service at National," HARRIS said on the House floor recently.

For the information of the Members, I wrote a letter to the Administrator, General McKee, last September 15, 1965, requesting a complete and prompt re-evaluation of this so-called policy. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., September 15, 1965.

Gen. WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MCKEE: A great deal of publicity has been given in the past months to the alleged refusal of the Federal Aviation Agency to grant commercial airlines the privilege of operating jet equipment in and out of Washington National Airport.

Many reasons have been given, some of which appear to be pure rationalization, in-

cluding the problems of jet noise, heavy traffic, etc.

Further, it has been suggested that the FAA has taken this position purely as a face-saving device in order to attract traffic into the so-called white elephant at Dulles International Airport, Chantilly, Va.

It seems to me as a private citizen, a frequent user of commercial airlines, and as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, that it is high time a realistic and logical approach be taken in this serious matter. I am advised that Mohawk Airlines are prepared to fly jet equipment into National Airport, whenever permitted; that United Airlines is scheduling Caravelle aircraft in flights from the West, including my district, but are being required to land at other than Washington National; that TWA, in the next month, will put 727's on their flights into this area and they, too, will be diverted to airports other than Washington National, because of this allegedly made ruling by your Agency.

Needless to say, persons from areas of less than 500 miles from the Nation's Capital will be required to spend as much, if not more time, using ground transportation from Dulles and Friendship, as it would take from their point of origin.

It is respectfully requested as a new Administrator of the FAA that you and your organization promptly reexamine this reported decision and take a realistic look at the needs of the flying public, and the convenience and necessity of jet service into Washington National Airport.

Your prompt reply and consideration will be indeed appreciated.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Member of Congress.

Although a reply has not yet been received, it seems to me this entire matter should be brought out into the open, and have it settled once and for all. General McKee's predecessor, Mr. Halaby, afforded himself the conveniences of Washington National, flying jet equipment in and out on frequent occasions. Obviously he was not concerned either with the noise or safety factor that is sometimes offered as an excuse. Private jets daily use this airport.

In my opinion, Washington National Airport, as presently constituted, is fully capable of efficiently handling commercial jet aircraft of the intermediate or short-range type, and I am looking forward with interest to the current attitude of the Agency and the Administrator.

CHICAGO URBAN RENEWAL AS VIEWED BY CITY RESIDENTS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, most speeches, comments or articles on urban renewal projects are delivered or written by public elected and appointed officials, or planners and architects who have an obvious interest in painting as attractive a picture of success as possible. There is

another side to this picture, however, which can be found in the opinions of the homeowners, tenants and the businessmen of an area marked for an urban renewal project. These are the people so often brushed aside as "marginal" businessmen or anachronisms obstructing the path of progress. Yet their opinions deserve to be heard and be considered.

For the past 2 years I have maintained an interest in a Chicago urban renewal project known as the Lincoln Park Area I project. Twice during this period of time a staff member from my office has toured the area and spoken to the residents and businessmen concerned. Although I have received much correspondence from throughout the country on various projects, none has ever approached the volume of mail I have received in connection with the Lincoln Park project.

From the information that I have acquired on Lincoln Park, the area has struck me as being one in which rehabilitation rather than clearance could be profitably followed. As the author of both the rehabilitation loan program in the 1964 Housing Act and section 307 of that act, which indicates congressional priority for rehabilitation rather than clearance whenever possible, I became interested in the manner in which these two provisions were being implemented by Federal and local officials. On June 21 of this year I wrote to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, with respect to rehabilitation for the area. In his reply of July 29, Dr. Weaver indicated that no section 307 determination has as yet been made in this case. He did indicate, however, that the project was to consist of a combination of clearance and rehabilitation activities, with an emphasis on rehabilitation and code enforcement. Dr. Weaver also indicated that the city of Chicago had been fully informed with respect to the availability of rehabilitation loans and the assistance available under code enforcement programs, both of which were increased in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

While the interest of Federal officials in a project emphasizing rehabilitation instead of clearance is gratifying, the information that I have received from the residents of the area concerned indicates that this may be a rehabilitation project in name only. The Lincoln Park Chamber of Commerce, in a recent survey, discovered that over 159 ground level businesses in the area would be replaced, with no provision made for their relocation. The Larrabee Street Neighborhood Improvement Association indicates that at no time were property owners in the area contacted with regard to their willingness to rehabilitate. Somewhere between 30 and 35 percent of the buildings in the project are scheduled to be demolished. Yet the residents of the area estimate that less than 3 percent of these are beyond repair or are owned by those not interested in rehabilitation in conformance with the urban renewal plans.

When residents of the area have attempted to improve their property, they

report that they have been discouraged by the City of Chicago Building Department on the grounds that this would be a waste of money in an urban renewal area where their property might very well be taken anyway. A survey indicating the willingness of property owners to participate in the new rehabilitation loan program under urban renewal has been ignored. A plan prepared by an outstanding firm of architects for the Lincoln Park Chamber of Commerce, which would have provided for a shopping center containing twice the number of sites for displaced businesses as the present approved plan was given no consideration at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other themes which reoccur in the letters I have received. Both deserve careful consideration in evaluating the success of any urban renewal program. First, there is the problem of local community representation in the preparation of a plan for the area. It is alleged, for example, that the local conservation community council represented only 5 percent of the population of the Lincoln Park area and that the plan was approved by only 10 percent of that limited membership.

Secondly, there is the question of the relocation and displacement of elderly and low income citizens from property which is either in perfectly good condition or could be rehabilitated. In so many instances, they become involuntary wards of the State in public housing or subsidized elderly housing projects as renters, rather than as homeowners. In the Lincoln Park project, a street of well kept homes, Shakespeare Avenue, is to be eliminated for a public park. At least a dozen of the homeowners in this area who have made an effort to keep up their property are widows or the elderly who will have almost no choice with respect to future housing.

The irony of this is the fact that this new neighborhood park is to be located only 3 blocks from Chicago's Lincoln Park. It is stated in defense of this proposal that Lincoln Park is a regional facility rather than a neighborhood facility and that the local high school is in need of more recreation area. One of the letters from the residents of the area, however, quotes the local high school principal as stating that he has sufficient space now and what he really needs is money to operate what he has already acquired. And it takes little imagination to realize that however regional a park may be in terms of areas served, it obviously also serves the purposes of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include in the RECORD a sampling of the letters I have received from tenants, homeowners, and businessmen in the Lincoln Park area with respect to the interest shown by local officials in a true rehabilitation and neighborhood conservation program. I would hope that Federal officials charged with the responsibility under section 307 of the Housing Act of 1965 relating to rehabilitation, would look beyond the formal presentations of local officials, and take into account the people involved.

The letters follow:

LINCOLN PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,

Chicago, Ill., August 26, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: On behalf of the Lincoln Park Chamber of Commerce, the oldest established group of businessmen in this area, we would like to have you consider the following objections to the Urban Renewal Project, Lincoln Park No. 1:

1. A recent survey by our organization shows that over 159 ground level businesses in this area would be replaced, with no provision made for their relocation. Recent statistics of the Small Business Administration show that one of every three of these businesses will not survive this relocation.

2. A plan submitted to the Department of Urban Renewal by this organization, prepared at our expense, by the firm of Holabird & Root, an outstanding firm of architects, received no consideration. This plan envisioned the retention of Ogden Avenue and Larrabee Street providing a shopping center at the corner of Ogden and Larrabee twice the size as that recommended by the Department of Urban Renewal. This shopping center would have given the dislocated merchants a location close to their current place of business with their present customers.

3. We object to the almost rubber-stamped approval of all provisions of this renewal project by the members of the Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council and the Lincoln Park Conservation Association. Not one member of the Conservation Community Council is a businessman directly affected by this plan. We consider this lack of representation unfair.

Your efforts to right these wrongs would be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL SAPPANOS,
President.

SHAKESPEARE AVENUE HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, Ill., August 20, 1965.

Re: Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Project No. 1, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am writing you in behalf of our organization in the Lincoln Park area.

The planners were successful in having the No. 1 Lincoln Park Urban Renewal project approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. However, we do not feel that the provisions and regulations of the 1964 Housing Act have been followed as provided in section 307.

The Lincoln Park area is not a slum area. We have large trees lining our streets and flowers in our yards.

Over \$15 million were spent for rehabilitation in the past 5 years in this area.

Why demolition now?

The project was approved 8 to 1 by a community conservation council.

However, 7 of these gentlemen do not live in the project area, and are not representative of the area.

It is true they held a number of hearings, however these hearings were a farce to our democratic way of doing things.

They did not seek any advice as to alternative forms of treatment for the area, or even specific parcels.

As a matter of fact, the eight council members who voted for the project were members of our community organizations and were advocating this project for some time. They were picked and nominated by

the urban renewal planners, and their names submitted to the mayor for appointment to their role.

The 3-hour hearing held by the subcommittee of the Chicago City Council allowed public witnesses, and a great majority spoke against the project. However, without adjourning or giving any consideration to the testimony given to them, they moved and adopted the previously prepared resolution without any comments, recommendations, and suggestions by any of the committee members on the subject, in less than 30 seconds.

Yours very truly,
SHAKESPEARE AVENUE HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION,
WILLIAM GRIMMISH.

NORTH AVENUE BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am writing to you on behalf of the members of the North Avenue Business Men's Association in the Lincoln Park area. We are of the opinion that section 307 of the Housing Act of 1964 requires surveys and plans indicating that the objectives of the urban renewal plan cannot be achieved by the rehabilitation of the project area, and such surveys are a prerequisite to a loan grant contract.

We feel that the Lincoln Park Conservation Council was not representative of a majority of the people of this area, but rather of small groups within the area. They did not seek any advice as to alternative methods of treatment for the area, or even specific parcels. The public meeting held prior to the adoption of the resolution required pursuant to section 307 procedure finding was already prepared before the meeting and was immediately adopted after allowing a few people to speak.

If urban renewal goes though as planned 150 merchants will be displaced, employing hundreds of people. It is true a shopping center will be built, but can only house 12 to 14 merchants. These few merchants, perhaps can pay the high rents of a shopping center. Prices will have to be higher in order to enable them to do so. However, what will happen to the other 136 merchants? Are their businesses to be shut down? Are they to be relocated to another neighborhood? If so, who will compensate these merchants for the loss of their customers' goodwill, which has taken decades to build up?

At no time were our member merchants allowed to present an alternative plan to the one that will destroy the whole north side of North Avenue. We, who stand to lose our stores and businesses stand ready to make any necessary improvements to our properties that will make North Avenue an outstanding shopping area. One that truly may become world famous. All we ask is the opportunity to do so before we are torn down.

Very truly yours,
NORTH AVENUE BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
JACK A. GERSHON, President.

LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, Ill., August 22, 1965.

Re: Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Project 1, Chicago, Ill.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are sending you information on violations of section 307 of the 1964 Housing Act. The following are questions we hope you will be interested in:

No. 1. Were residents informed that Federal funds are available for rehabilitation?

Definitely not. Residents in demolition areas were told repeatedly by Urban Renewal personnel that they should not repair, paint, nor spend any money whatsoever on improvements. That the building would be torn down, and that any money spent would be lost. Property owners were told they had no choice except to wait for urban renewal.

Owners of property not at this time scheduled for demolition are not aware that they will be forced to remodel or be condemned. (As stated by Mr. Hill in Real Estate News, July 12, 1965.) They are not only not aware that they will have to rehabilitate, but they certainly know nothing about Federal funds available for this purpose.

Residents who tried to express their opposition to the plans were allowed no voice at meeting of the local organizations. Even paid up members (the only ones allowed to speak or vote) of Lincoln Park Conservation Association who were not among the chosen few were allowed no voice at meetings.

Our organization requested hearings before the Conservation Community Council but were always deprived of the opportunity. This is covered by material attached.

No. 2. Plans for relocation of residents and businessmen.

In the city of Chicago no urban renewal project has relocated either residents nor businessmen. The only place residents can go is into public housing, and these in Chicago are our worst ghettos.

And the only place a businessman can go is out of business.

A woman who has three children to support inquired about where she could move and was quoted a rental and when she said she could not afford this was told she should get another family to move in with her to share expenses. Her answer was that if she wanted to live like people in Russia, she would move to Russia.

No one moved out of an urban renewal area ever returns. Rents are too high. Nor can small businessmen pay rentals in large shopping areas. These are without exception leased to large chain stores, or in other words to big business.

There is no relocation. Displacement will be financial ruin for not only residents and businessmen, but for property owners as well. About 99 percent of the senior citizens who are independent now will become dependents when they are dislocated.

No. 3. Were residents or property owners contacted regarding their willingness to rehabilitate?

They were not. The only time property owners were contacted was by "inspectors" hired by Urban Renewal who told the owner that the property would be torn down. Many people as long ago as March of 1963 were confident that they would receive money from Urban Renewal no later than the first of May of that year. People who are willing to sell their property at a reasonable market value are told to hang onto the property that they will get more from Urban Renewal. This is done because Urban Renewal does not want any new owner to do any remodeling in the demolition areas. Everything possible has been done by the Department of Urban Renewal to discourage any improvements being made. Many residents in the project have been moved twice before by Urban Renewal, and always at a financial loss.

Possibly worse than being uninformed is being misinformed. In Chicago there is no publicity on urban renewal except what is released by the Department of Urban Renewal.

Within the next few weeks we will start sending you sworn statements from property owners, tenants, and businessmen covering these points.

In the meantime if you have any suggestions we will be more than happy to cooperate.

Thanking you for your interest, we are,
Respectfully yours,
LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION.

LARRABEE NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1965.

Copies to: President Johnson, Mr. Weaver, Department of Urban Renewal, Mayor Daley, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Ronald Reagan, Chicago Tribune, Chicago Sun Times, Chicago American, Chicago Daily News, Time magazine.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: Attached is the letter our president Mr. Budd had hoped to present to the Conservation Community Council, June 21, 1965, when the plans for Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Project 1 were approved. However, time was not allowed. The 1 hour allotted for hearing opposition to the plan was abused. Board members spoke, especially Father Wangler spoke and said loss of home or business will not be too bad and people will not suffer too much. What is too much? This attitude is not usually associated with the ministry.

It was also stated by the board that a majority of the residents of the project approved the plans. The plans were approved by paid membership associations. Total membership in these organizations is less than 5 percent of the population of the area. Attendance at meetings is less than 10 percent of membership. How could a majority of the residents have approved the plan?

Our organization was formed 1 year ago in February, and we have accomplished much compared to the 10 years others had.

One member of the Conservation Community Council stated he had heard of Larrabee Street Neighborhood Improvement Association a couple of times. We do not know where he has been. Our organization had 200 people at the public hearing at St. Michael's church. Ninety percent of people attending were opposed to the plan. We have attended and spoken at each C.C.C. meetings since.

We wrote the C.C.C. and asked to be heard, but our hearing was always postponed.

Also enclosed are letters from residents of the area, and from alarmed residents of future project 2. As Dr. Rosner so kindly stated in his interview with the Chicago Tribune, "hecklers from Larrabee Street and Shakespeare Avenue" also wrote.

Urban Renewal takes full credit for the millions of private dollars being spent in the neighborhood, and states that without the plan the neighborhood will deteriorate. Once a neighborhood starts to rehabilitate itself, it continues. And that has happened in Lincoln Park.

Respectfully,
LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
HELEN KELLEY, Secretary.

To: The Chicago City Council and to each and every committee or agency of the city of Chicago which has or will vote on the approval or disapproval of the plan for project 1 of the Lincoln Park General Neighborhood Renewal Plan.

LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 12, 1965.

GENTLEMEN: We are requesting a postponement of the vote to approve or disapprove the plans as presented in booklet captioned "Lincoln Park, Project 1, Chicago, Ill." and dated June 1965.

We request this postponement on the plea that at no time were the residents, property owners, or business people of our organization given an opportunity to present their

opinions on the project. This request was acknowledged by the Conservation Community Council, and was scheduled for hearing, but each time was postponed.

We have a survey of the Larrabee Street neighborhood which indicates that \$2 million will be spent by property owners and tenants.

On page 5 of this booklet it reads "All affected community organizations generally approved the design plan proposals with the result that the basic concepts of this plan have been incorporated into the Urban Renewal Plan for Lincoln Park Project 1." Our organization knew nothing of these plans. We state that people in the areas of demolition not only did not approve the plan, but were completely uninformed. That the areas to be demolished were planned by people who do not live in the areas, and who will not be affected by the plan. That the people most affected by demolition had no voice whatsoever. The basic laws of urban renewal are for the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and state that there must be citizen participation.

We object to the statement on the fifth page which states "New residential development is designed to preserve the present diversity of structure types, accommodations, and income levels."

Rents in the area designated for acquisition average about \$55 per month. These units are four rooms or more and are rented by families who cannot afford to pay more. These people are low- to middle-income families with children. Living in this area and paying these rents they are able to budget college educations for their children, as evidenced by the 40 percent of graduates from Waller who go from high school to college. Relocation of these people without creating financial hardships, and without depriving children of an education, is completely impossible. Preserving accommodations, and income levels is absurd. It isn't necessary to be an expert in the construction field to know that the cost of construction makes it impossible to build even one-room apartments that could rent for \$55 per month. How can the income level remain the same?

We propose that the plan be revamped and made realistic. That contradictions be omitted. Such as the statement which reads "Present lack of public recreational space will be remedied by construction of a neighborhood park, two smaller playgrounds and a number of public plaza areas designed for pedestrian use." Residents in the area are not aware of a lack of so-called public recreational space. Lincoln Park is one of the most beautiful parks in the world, and is within walking distance of everyone. Tot lots referred to on page 13 have been frowned upon by planning commissions for years. The expense of caring for these small plots is exorbitant, and to police them is completely impossible. There are vacant areas on Larrabee Street which could be acquired for playgrounds and could be policed by the residents.

Public plazas are universally known to be fair playgrounds for muggers, rapists, and gang wars. Why create a future slum? Other urban renewal projects have, after a few years, proven this to be the case. It is the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker who make the backbone of a solid, stable community. Chicago needs middle income families. This is essential to keep industry from moving to the suburbs, and for the preservation of the city.

Contradictions dealing with businesses are found throughout the document. "The specific planning proposals contained in this urban renewal plan will enhance the project area as a desirable urban community and will encourage the physical rehabilitation of residential, business and institutional properties." This has already been accomplished and more will be done when people know what they can expect.

On page 15 it reads, "Some properties not herein designated for acquisition and clearance may be so designated by amendment to the urban renewal plan." Why aren't these properties, or at least some of them, designated at this time? Is it because they are owned by members of associations whose support was needed to approve the plan?

On page 3 it is stated, "Existing retail complexes should be retained where feasible and first priority be given to displaced businessmen, where possible and legal, either in existing or new shopping areas, and the overall amount of retail space should be reduced." Does this make sense, or is it possible in any way?

This is not a plan for the benefit of a community, but a dream. Chicago has been a vigorous city in the past, but every year is becoming weaker and weaker. Our middle-income families are moving to the suburbs, our industry is moving to the suburbs, money is moving to other areas. Unless the trend changes Chicago will become a ghost city. Chicago needs attractions to draw people for vacations, and conventions and what is more interesting than historical old town?

As an improvement association we are interested in the improvement of our neighborhood. Our plan is based on the desire of the residents and property owners, and business people to conform with the plan of urban renewal for project 1, for conservation and rehabilitation. Why should 40 percent of the residents of an area be the victims of the whim of less than 1 percent of the population of the area? We are prepared to present from each property owner his intentions for the rehabilitation of his building. If the owner is not interested in this and refuses to sell to someone who will rehabilitate, the property would be subject to code enforcement by our association.

Our survey shows many small businessmen and residents of the area in need of good residential property and ready to cooperate with us for the rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

We are requesting time to present this plan. A door-to-door survey is slow hard work, and we need time to make this plan workable with the Department of Urban Renewal. If residents of the area will rehabilitate at their own expense it would seem a great shame that this money couldn't be spent more profitably for benefit of the citizens of the area.

As citizens of the area we want participation not annihilation.

Our organization is strongly opposed to the demolition of the Larrabee Street neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted.

LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
HARLEY A. BUDD, President.

Copies to: President Johnson, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Ronald Reagan, Mayor Daley, Chicago Tribune, Chicago American, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Sun Times, Time magazine.

LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., August 2, 1965.

Attention: Mr. Mayer, Mr. Hill.

LINCOLN PARK,
CONSERVATION COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Chicago, Ill.
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN RENEWAL,
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: On or about June 10, 1965, we wrote you for information as to where we could obtain large-scale maps. To date we have had no answer, so once again we are asking for the information.

We are prepared to present a preliminary plan of Larrabee Street at this time, and

later other streets in the neighborhood. This plan will show the construction, the condition, and the intentions of the owner.

Therefore you can appreciate that a large-scale map of the area is essential.

We also request a meeting to discuss these plans. Your help and suggestions could be very valuable to us. This we also asked for in a previous letter.

A response at your earliest convenience will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

LARRABEE STREET NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
HARLEY A. BUDD, President.

Copies to:

President Johnson,
Mayor Daley,
Mr. Weaver, Department of Urban Renewal;

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY,
Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Senator DIRKSEN,
Chicago Tribune, Sun Times, American & Daily News,
Time Magazine.

HALFPENNY, HAHN & RYAN,
Chicago, Ill., July 12, 1965.

Re Lincoln Park, Area 1, project.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter will bring you up to date in regard to the Lincoln Park Area, project 1, in Chicago, of which we have previously conferred and corresponded. The part 1, loan and grant application for this project was returned by the Urban Renewal Administration, Washington, D.C. and was approved July 7, by the Chicago City Council so is now being returned to Washington for final approval.

A meeting was held a week ago by the Lincoln Park Conservation Community Organization in regard to the plan, at which time numerous objectors appeared. Each was given only a few minutes, oral statements were not transcribed. No consideration was given to any of the recommended changes or plans submitted, and an immediate vote was taken by the committee for approval. The committee itself is not representative of the area, nor interested in the local residents' welfare. Many of the people living in the area are extremely bitter because they feel this is being promoted by certain real estate and financial interests to their detriment. A great majority of the neighborhood is opposed to the demolition of their homes, which are sound, well maintained, and owned by people who have lived their entire life in the area. This is not a slum area, and the people themselves are desirous of improving it.

Members of the local committee are all impractical people, most of them being connected with churches or hospitals, that will benefit by obtaining property that they would otherwise have to purchase. The one businessman, a banker, voted against the plan.

Public hearings were held July 6, before a subcommittee of the Chicago City Council, which was merely perfunctory. They allowed the objectors to testify, but immediately at the close of the testimony in open meeting, with no discussion, approved the plan and recommended that it be adopted, which was done at full council meeting next day with no comments.

It appears the plan does not comply with title III of the 1965 Housing Act. The demolishing of homes for people only three blocks from Lincoln Park and making Larrabee Street, which has always been commercial, residential, are the two real sources of conflict. The Larrabee Improvement Association prepared a survey showing the nature of each building and what amount owners

would expend to rehabilitate or repair present structures, but this was given no attention.

Is there anything that you could recommend we do in Washington that would delay or change the plan? It is our intention to contest the plan in court on behalf of Krema and some others and we would appreciate any idea or suggestion you could give us.

With kind personal regards.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD T. HALFPENNY.

HALFPENNY, HAHN & RYAN,
Chicago, Ill., August 18, 1965.

Re Lincoln Park No. 1 urban renewal project,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. WILLIAM WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am writing on behalf of Krema Trucking Co., a common carrier registered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and one of the oldest operators in the Chicago area, located at 1735 North Larrabee Street, Chicago, Ill., as well as other business interests, in the Lincoln Park area project.

From my study of the Housing Act of 1964, it appears that section 307 of the act requires surveys and plans, indicating that the objectives of an urban renewal plan cannot be achieved through rehabilitation of the project area, and that such is a prerequisite to allowing a loan grant contract.

For the record, I will recite some background information. The Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council membership was not representative of the area, its membership consisted of clergymen and doctors connected with institutions in the area, all interested in obtaining additional parking facilities, with other members living on the east side "gold coast" area. They did not seek, request, or allow any advice or plans as to alternate forms of treatment for the area, or for even alternate use for specific parcels involved. In fact, all such offers were summarily dismissed. The council did hold a number of meetings which I attended as an observer. They did not allow anyone to speak or enter into any discussion. The several meetings where they allowed interested people to testify, none of their suggestions were recorded or adopted. I addressed a public meeting held the same night as the council adopted the resolution required under section 307 procedures. No consideration was given to any suggestion, or any of the recommendations, nor was any alternate suggestion or plan made by the Board. The resolution had already been prepared prior to the meeting and was immediately adopted. The only real local businessman on the board, vice president of a local bank, voted against its adoption.

The subcommittee hearing in the Chicago city council followed similar tactics, allowing public witnesses to make statements. I was among them. However, without even adjourning or giving any consideration whatsoever to the information submitted, the resolution was adopted without any comments, recommendations, or suggestions.

My client, Mr. Krema, had an architectural plan prepared for additional improvements to his property, primarily of an esthetic nature, due to the fact his buildings are of excellent construction and well maintained. The only opportunity he was given to present such plans was before the special House committee hearing held in Chicago with the Honorable Congressman KLUZYNSKI presiding. Numerous individual property owners have stated that when they requested permits to improve their property, the city of Chicago building department would discourage them on the basis that any improvement was a waste of money, that the area was in urban renewal, and they would no doubt lose it.

The present Lincoln Park No. 1 Area plan is substantially the same as submitted prior to the passage of the 1964 Housing Act—no opportunity was allowed the residents to make valuable suggestions. For example, the elimination of Ogden Avenue, a diagonal main thoroughfare, developed and widened at great public expense, never properly studied. Business interests indicate a desire to purchase property if title could be cleared in regard to numerous small triangle spaces so as to give full frontage on the street.

Due to this procedure there is deep resentment of the majority of the home owners and small businessmen located in the area, the only organizations that have approved are the ones that benefit substantially by the terms of the plan to the detriment of the entire area.

If detailed information can be of any assistance or value, we will be happy to furnish it. We appreciate your continued interest in the small home owner and businessman, especially when they are not located in your district or State, thus you are surely performing a great public service.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD T. HALFPENNY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 25, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am one of the widows (widow 24 years) who is going to lose her home for a park. I lived in my home for 38 years, it was a new building just completed when I purchased it. I've kept it up to standard on all repairs when it needed it, there isn't a thing wrong with the building.

Why they picked this site for a park is just outrageous. We have one of the largest, most beautiful parks four blocks from my home (Lincoln Park). There are many schools which I could mention by name that are on main streets with no park close by nor even a playground for children.

We are promised low-income housing at reasonable rates. One old home on Dickens Street was remodeled and rents for \$180 a month. Another new apartment building on Dickens just completed, rents for \$300 per month or if one wants to buy the unit it costs \$37,000. Is that reasonable?

I had planned to retire at 62 years and rent a room or two which would have helped me, as I have a heart condition, high blood pressure, and arthritis. From where I live it takes me 10 minutes to get to work, when I lose my home where will I go that is so convenient? One does not receive enough money to buy a new home and rents are tremendously high.

I raised two children, my son fought in the Korean war, was left with a very bad heart condition, is that what he fought for?

If they demolish everything at one time people will have to find homes—then do they expect us to come back into this same area to the new low rental houses for the elderly? Why not build apartment buildings somewhere in this neighborhood before tearing all of it down, so that we can move into the new homes when ours are torn down and we are evicted?

People outside of the park area voted for this project, those living in the park area had no chance to voice their opinions against it—we are all displaced with a promise of low rental houses—we cannot get in as promised—rents are too high and we heard there is a waiting list of 27,000 for some of the high rise buildings—people outside of this project seem to come first? Is this justice, it's against the Constitution.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. MARGARET B. WILSON.

A. HUMBERT & Co.,
Chicago, Ill., May 22, 1964.

Congressman WILLIAM BECK WIDNALL,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am told that you are "Interviewing individuals who are directly affected by urban renewal." I am happy that someone is interested in the manner in which this vast "pork barrel" is being conducted.

Our office is just outside the boundaries of the "Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Area" on Chicago's North Side. My experience with urban renewal is limited to this one project. The following are my observations, concisely stated. I will be happy to go into greater detail if you wish.

1. One of the problems is that "only persons directly affected" is interpreted as those who live in the renewal area. For example, Lincoln Avenue is one of the longest thoroughfares in Chicago, used by many people from the northwest areas of the city to the downtown area. Yet, those people in the renewal area, who live along just four blocks of Lincoln Avenue, have decreed that this great thoroughfare should no longer be a through street. None of the residents or businessmen along the street have been consulted nor do they have a voice in this matter.

2. The preponderant benefits of this program are given over to nontaxpaying groups, who are in the area: DePaul University, McCormick Theological Seminary, and the following hospitals: St. Joseph's, Augustana, Grant, Children's Memorial; each is purported to be nonprofit, yet each found the funds to undertake huge expansions; suddenly there was no parking space—and urban renewal generously stepped in to make up the loss.

3. The primary goal of urban renewal should be the upgrading of existing residential properties. Instead of this, we find the large-scale relocation of the underprivileged only to make room for the more affluent (for example, Carl Sandburg Village). There is also too much emphasis on commercial (shopping centers, etc.) when we already have a tremendous number of vacant stores along our strip streets.

Your interest is appreciated; your study is invited to these problems.

Yours very truly,

ALFRED HUMBERT, Jr.,
Realtor.

CHICAGO CASTER & EQUIPMENT CO., INC.,
Chicago, Ill., August 20, 1965.

Re Lincoln Park No. 1, Urban Renewal Project, Chicago, Ill.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am writing you on behalf of the members of our organization in the Lincoln Park area. We are of the opinion that section 307 of the Housing Act of 1965 requires surveys and plans indicating that the objectives of the urban renewal plan cannot be achieved through rehabilitation of the project area, and such is a prerequisite to a loan grant contract. The Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council was not representative of the area. They did not seek any advice as to alternative forms of treatment for the area, or even specific parcels. It is true they held a number of meetings at which they did allow people to speak, and at meetings where they allowed people to protest none of their suggestions were recorded or adopted. The public meeting held prior to the adoption of the resolution required pursuant to section 307 procedure finding was already prepared before the meeting and was immediately adopted after allowing people to speak.

The subcommittee hearing of the Chicago City Council allowed public witnesses, but without adjourning or giving any considera-

tion to the information given to them they moved and adopted the previously prepared resolution without any comments, recommendations, and suggestions by anyone on the subject.

We do not feel, that we were amply advised on the situation. May we have your views on the above?

Very truly yours,

W. H. RISKE,
President.

LIFE-TIME BLIND & SHUTTER CO.,
Chicago, Ill., August 17, 1965.

Re Lincoln Park No. 1 urban renewal project, Chicago, Ill.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: In reference to the Lincoln Park No. 1 urban renewal project in Chicago, Ill., we wish to state that we do not feel that the provisions and regulations of the 1964 Housing Act have been followed as provided in section 307.

We are a small business concern. We own and occupy a building comprising 12,500 square feet. We are a growing concern now located in a neighborhood that we feel is one in which we can be of a great asset to the community—one in which our 20 employees are not anxious to leave because of good transportation and we feel that we have a good building and are most willing to make improvements which will enhance this street.

At no time has any representative ever approached us to ask us what we would do to improve our building. We have not been asked for any plans or surveys of improvement. We therefore feel the Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council did not represent truly the people in this area and feel in so doing that section 307 of the Housing Act has been violated.

We do not wish to relocate our business or employees and are most anxious to be given the opportunity of making any improvement to our building which will aid in the rehabilitation of this community.

Very truly yours,

LIFE-TIME BLIND & SHUTTER CO.,
BERNARD MARKS.

ART FURNITURE SHOP,
Chicago, Ill., August 20, 1965.

Re: Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Project I, Chicago, Ill.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: We are located in the area of Lincoln Park Urban Renewal Project I and are of the opinion that section 307 of the Housing Act of 1964 has not been complied with.

We feel that the Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council did not truly represent the majority of the people in the proposed project.

The original committees and organizations formed, with conservation as their goal were infiltrated with people, who in their small meetings favored demolition rather than conservation.

One of the oldest organizations in the Lincoln Park area, the Lincoln Park Chamber of Commerce was not represented on the Community Conservation Council and could have rendered valuable assistance in views, plans and needs of the area.

We are a small business concern and have been in the same location since 1925. We have been an asset to the community in the fine arts field and wish to remain here as an asset to the culture of this area.

No council member or representative has approached us and asked for plans, views or expressions as to how we could enhance or improve our building.

We therefore feel that the Housing Act, section 307, has been violated by the Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council in not honestly representing the people of the area and primarily the ones in the planned project I area.

Yours truly,

ART FURNITURE SHOP,
HOWARD W. JEMO.

HERMAN SEEKAMP, INC.,
August 20, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am writing to you in regard to Lincoln Park No. 1 urban renewal project in Chicago.

I own and operate a small wholesale bakery employing 45 people with an annual payroll of \$250,000. Obviously I have a sizable personal investment in our present location. A move will be very costly. Property adjacent to mine is available should we be able to stay here. I would be willing to build and upgrade the entire property with assurance of a long-term lease availability.

We are of the opinion that section 307 of the Housing Act of 1964 requires surveys and plans indicating that the objectives of the urban renewal plan cannot be achieved through rehabilitation of the project area, and such is a prerequisite to a loan grant contract. The Lincoln Park Conservation Community Council was not representative of the area. They did not seek any advice as to alternative forms of treatment for the area, or even specific parcels. It is true they held a number of meetings at which they did not allow people to speak, and at meetings where they allowed people to protest none of their suggestions were recorded or adopted. The public meeting held prior to the adoption of the resolution required pursuant to section 307 procedure finding was already prepared before the meeting and was immediately adopted after allowing people to speak.

The subcommittee hearing of the Chicago City Council allowed public witnesses, but without adjourning or giving any consideration to the information given to them they moved and adopted the previously prepared resolution without any comments, recommendations, and suggestions by any one on the subject.

Sincerely,

WILLARD W. BICKFORD,
President.

TAT LING CHAN,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Having heard the bad news from the urban renewal intended to demolish Larrabee Street, rendering me, and those people who are living, and doing business in that street wish to cry, but no tears, for losing homes and business. No wonder everyone living in the Larrabee Street is unhappy.

The President announced in the newspapers stated that he will try his best to overcome the people poverty. Then if the urban renewal will decide to demolish Larrabee Street, no wonder the residents and businessmen of that street will suffer more hardships and poverty.

So far I know the American citizens can enjoy more freedom than any other citizens in the world. Therefore I beg to take the liberty to against the urban renewal to do so.

I and all the other residents of Larrabee Street will be much appreciated, if you will kindly see your way to stop the urban renewal demolishing Larrabee Street according to your convenience. If so the God will bless

you, and your family good luck, and long life.

Hoping this will meet with your favorable consideration.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Yours obediently,

TAT LING CHAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 18, 1965.

Re Lincoln Park Project No. 1 Urban Renewal, Chicago, about section 307.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I live in project No. 1, in the area proposed for a community park, which is not necessary because of the three blocks distance from the famous Lincoln Park. My sister and I attended most of these neighborhood meetings, and those of the CCC which is a panel of 11 men, handpicked by the mayor and ironically most of them do not reside in the project No. 1—so how can they know and vote on our problems unless they are briefed by urban renewal. At no time at any of these meetings was there ever any mention of the Housing Act of 1964 known as section 307. My neighbors who also attended these meetings can attest to this statement.

We were told that we could be observers at the CCC meetings but could not have the floor to ask questions or have any voice whatever. On this CCC panel were Daggett Harvey, a millionaire residing on Lake Shore Drive who could not care less what happened to our homes, two ministers, one bowed out gracefully when he learned that most of us oldtimers were members of his church and would be victims of the bulldozer (this was Rev. Gerhard Grauer), one lawyer (employed days by the railroad), a Catholic priest from a nontaxable institution who was anything but courteous and had pressure tactics, asking the pastor of Peoples Baptist Church if they did not want to take their money from urban renewal and move elsewhere (they already were displaced two times), which they refused to consider at that meeting. If they have since used persuasion, I do not know. The next man was the secretary of Aetna bank who was absolutely against the proposed park, Dr. Marvin Rosner, on staff at Grant Hospital who was using pressure for more land for the hospital, an artist, and Mr. * * * who also resided way out of the project.

I think I stated in a previous letter that I called at the office of Lincoln Park Conservation at 2419 North Halsted Street, stating I wanted to make extensive improvements—new stairs and wrought fence and was told by William Friedlander who consulted a map and then replied not to spend any more money on my home. That was 28 months ago.

Was it the purpose to create slum property by advising us not to spend money to make these improvements if we were willing and had the cash to pay for same.

My sister is a widow, is self-sufficient from daily employment and lives in our late father's home, which was handed down to him from his forefathers—Civil War veteran 1849—that's a long record of ownership and paying taxes, plus grassroots. Now to be displaced would indeed be a hardship.

My husband, 76, and I, 68, live in the same area and have the threat of the bulldozer at our door.

It's inhuman and unjust to root us out in new surroundings at our age. Living in a housing project is not the answer at our age.

We want the "go sign" to make improvements on our own and continue living in familiar surroundings.

Mrs. JOHN ABDALLAH.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 26, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Congressman of New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We of the Lincoln Park urban renewal project I, humbly suggest that legislation of some sort be considered to relieve the vicious injustices regarding the same.

Wherever urban renewal enters an area, the tax-exempt institutions such as churches, hospitals, and schools, start the land grab with the innocent friendly neighborhood meetings to supposedly improve our areas.

Soon a map is shown, showing the land to be allotted each of these community centers.

Then come the big deal real estate operators with scare stories about the bulldozers coming, and we'll get nothing for our property. They have bought up valuable locations as people panicked and sold for minimal sums.

They then proceeded to fill the area with Puerto Rican tenants who are making life unbearable until such time we can teach them the conditions of urban living. They brought to our area a terrible crime wave of every description, including a national car-theft gang which was exposed.

We have lived for 12 years with the threat of demolition of our homes. The neighbors around us have fought to keep their homes in decent condition, but through discouragement and an uphill battle, find we must have help or we will lose everything.

When the urban renewal wants a particular property, they move in with the building code inspectors.

A prominent building engineer spoke before the city council in Chicago city hall. He stated that there was no downtown building that he had worked on (and he gave the names of many) from 1938 up to some of our recent models, that could pass the present building code inspections. These excessively abusive codes enter wherever urban renewal is accepted. Any building not in accordance with this urban renewal code, is judged to be substandard. With that word, they heap on the abuses of power to demand building code compliance; or they proceed through the code to show that your property has no value as it would cost too much to recondition it.

They demand an architect's blueprint of your home, before you can proceed to make the code repairs. This is \$500 on up.

The usual procedure is to then apply for a loan to make the repairs.

Of the many cases presented before the Chicago City Council, by the Chicago Property Owners Association, none was able to get a loan from any bank, though from every aspect, the owner had reliable assets and collateral.

When the owner could not show proof of the total contracting job in action within 30 days, they were taken to court. Thereafter they were fined \$200 for each day that they were not in compliance on their particular building code violations.

Innumerable property owners have lost their homes due to these lecherous laws in Chicago, or wherever urban renewal goes. The property is then seized for the urban renewal project on hand.

Some property owners are jailed because there is no possible way they could pay \$200 per day for their fine. Such laws are more unjust than usurious loan sharks.

At a recent urban renewal meeting for our Lincoln Park project I, a director stated that they were going to build a home for the aged, giving the exact location in our area where it would be built. A neighbor told the speaker she did not know how he could make that statement, as she knew the owner of

that property, and it had not as yet been acquired for urban renewal.

The man who owns this building has invested large sums to have it in first-class condition. The squads of code men have made 87 visits (which he has properly dated and recorded) keeping him tearing up and repairing. It is evident that unless he has some help, he will soon be compelled to relinquish his property to the authorities.

There are 644 homes involved in this project. Also truckers, small factories, many businessmen's establishments which all helpfully employ and serve members of the community. They are planning to completely cut off two great business and travel thoroughfares—Lincoln Avenue, also Ogden Avenue. These streets are of great importance commercially and for good transportation.

On your road maps you will note that Ogden Avenue is Route 34, which takes you all the way to St. Louis, Mo.

Lincoln Avenue angles north and west from its start at 1600 North in Chicago, ending in the suburb Skokie.

They propose to take away a portion of these avenues with each new urban renewal project, as they would proceed in the future. When you study the length of Ogden and Lincoln Avenues you will have a slight idea of the enormity of their destructive schemes.

Urban renewal planners are, at random, mapping serious dislocations of homes and businesses. They are planning three green spots for the area; two of the three are for the Catholic Church properties.

My particular problem is a planned bulldozing of 144 homes and businesses to make a park for Waller High School. Waller already has a half city block of play area. The Christ Presbyterian Church is moving and this area will be added to the half block playground.

Lincoln Park Zoo is 4 blocks east of the Waller High School. It has four baseball diamonds, tennis courts, shuffleboard, horse-shoe games, archery, and gun clubs, Belmont Yacht Harbor rented boats and boat lagoon, bridge paths (horses may be rented near the park), pony rides, and places to enjoy other hobbies. Picnic grounds, carousel, miniature diesel train rides, a special children's zoo, also two museums, a park meeting hall center, a golf course.

The zoo area is now in the process of constructing a farm exhibit which will also show the farm animals in a rural atmosphere. It is expected to be interesting and educational. Lincoln Park Zoo is regarded as one of the finest zoos in the world. Most every one has at one time enjoyed Marlin Perkins most interesting TV show "Zoo Parade" from Lincoln Park Zoo. Mr. Perkins is now associated with the St. Louis zoo.

There is 25-cent bus transportation in close range to all in our neighborhood (which includes Waller High) who desire a ride to the zoo (Lincoln Park). We think the young people of our area are specially privileged to be so located.

U.R. planners mention the Arnold School in connection with a playground for Waller High. Arnold School is one-storied and admits only two grades of junior high. It is located beside the one-half block playground which is being enlarged.

When all these facts were disclosed to Louis W. Hill, deputy commissioner of urban renewal in Chicago he stated that Lincoln Park Zoo was decadent for present-day use and that four blocks was too far for mothers to take their children to the park.

We would presume that we must therefore, tear down areas every three blocks to give like privileges to other mothers across the United States.

There are 15 widows in our block that I know of. My mother and I count as 2; 14

widows are property owners. We have owned our 2-story building which contains 2 apartments (also a 2-truck garage at rear) for 24 years. We are all self-supporting, with rental incomes, jobs, and pensions. We all own our own homes clear. We are part of this wasteful project 1 which plans to tear our homes down for an unnecessary park for the Waller and Arnold Schools. The police are continually being called for racial rumbles around the schools. It seems the plan is to give them a larger battleground.

We neighbors maintain good, clean, comfortable homes for our tenants, with reasonable rents. We have beautiful trees and grass on our parkways, and most homes have flowers and gardens in their backyards.

We are of ages (by the time we own our property clear of debt) that we are ineligible for financial loans, to get a similar rental property at present-day prices.

The urban renewal plan is to place older persons with our problem in old age housing. They plan to offer a 3-room unit with bath for \$52 per month.

Some elderly people's only source of income is their rental income. Some have very small social security pensions. After the pittance they will offer for our properties have been lived up, many will be welfare cases. This statement is not exaggerated.

Mayor Daley has kept up a continuous harangue about slumlords to psychologically condition the public for urban renewal and its disastrous upheavals and treachery. We find that all those who are for urban renewal, have ulterior motives. We believe this area of Project I to be the most desirable location in the city of Chicago. Our home location is 21 blocks north of State and Madison (which is the center of the Chicago downtown which divides the north and south sides of Chicago). Our home is 600 West (which means it is 6 blocks west of Lake Michigan). The east side of Lincoln Park faces Lake Michigan. We are on the extreme north end of Project I. It is evident that those who live south of us are closer to the downtown area.

We suggest that Federal funds for urban renewal be withheld until we are given a referendum at the polls.

We will be most grateful for any help you can send our way to save our homes and businesses.

Sincerely,

Mrs. YVONNE A. NEWLIN.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIDNALL: I'm adding this bit of information. The officers of Lincoln Park Conservation Association are appointed by Mayor Daley. When people who paid for membership realized that they had no voice in the organization, they withdrew. The officers had a sneak vote one night when there were only 11 Lincoln Park conservation members present. These 11 members were the only ones (of a large audience) who were allowed to vote for or against Lincoln Park Project 1. They unanimously voted against it, but they were outnumbered by Daley's appointed officers and some bearded beatniks who joined with the officers in the vote. That is the way the approval for Lincoln Park Project 1 took place.

There are no property owners in the entire area who want anything to do with this horror.

We have organized to combat it as best we can with our small incomes.

Wasteful urban renewal projects will finish ruining the economy of our Nation far greater than an enemy nation.

The only interest in the United States seems to be civil rights. Perhaps the knowledge that Negro's homes are also included in Project I, may arouse some interest.

We thank you for your interest and consideration.

Mrs. YVONNE A. NEWLIN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

July 11, 1964.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: I am glad to hear that you were in Chicago to study plan I of the Lincoln Park redevelopment project.

I am a property owner in that area, and am against the plan as are many people who live there.

It should be canceled until there is proof that it is needed or helpful.

Let the people who are involved decide—not the politicians.

Sincerely,

MARGO H. BUEKAR.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

August 12, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Without exception during the past 3 years it has been my duty as a neighbor in our community to meet with and support the wishes of the elderly folks, homeowners, and tenants residing in the area designated as project 1 (called the park area).

These folks have placed their confidence in my efforts to help if possible to save their homes and present living status.

Meetings held were supposed to be of interest and information as to proceedings in the area were merely camouflage.

If and when even a paid-up member was on the floor to request information on subjects relative to important matters, concerning loans, rehabilitation and interest rates, they were rudely told by the chairman, Lyle Mayer, that they were out of order, as the commission members were the ones to direct and plan for the area, not an individual. The police were requested to stop anyone and eject them bodily, which they tried to do.

As section 307 of the Housing Act of 1964 supports financing of projects for rehabilitation, we see no need for the paid-up taxpayers who have lived and financed their share of the cities' prosperity through some 50 and probably more years of hard-earned money to be treated as nincompoops.

No one in project I approves of the park.

At one of the CCC meetings we attended at Arnold School we pleaded for our homes and opposed the park, which is supposed to be a need for Waller High.

Waller High has already acquired all the land they need, which put about 500 people out of their homes.

At this same meeting attended Principal Ellenbogen and stated, "I heard your pleas for your homes, I want to assure you, Waller High has all the land they need. We do not want your homes. It's funds we need to operate our needs."

This is just a greedy scheme of the planners.

So in the name of justice, please Mr. WIDNALL, help us retain our homes and freedom again.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEONE V. GUSMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., August 16, 1965.

Re: Project No. 1, urban renewal.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Section 307 Housing Act of 1964 has been absolutely disregarded by members of Urban Renewal, the Commission and affiliated organizations whenever the matter is brought up for further advice and consultation.

Rehabilitating in this area for the elderly is a major problem in many instances and

important under the present rigid codes, as being enforced by the present administration. Many family homes can be saved in this area if the law was explained and enacted fully.

When the first views of urban renewal, in the area known now as project No. 1, became public through a map issued by a local newspaper 5 years ago people were stunned; as it was not classed as a slum or blighted area.

Many people profited by the knowledge, especially those affiliated with the various groups, officers and their families connected with the Lincoln Park Association. Through smart promoters, homes were purchased at low prices and rehabilitated and resold or held as an investment because of the close proximity to Project No. 1.

As a member of Lincoln central and part owner of property here, I attended meetings continuously (for 3 or 4 years monthly). Very little information, if any, was ever given on the project. Meaningless programs on film, lectures, and talks on various subjects not related voting on any subject was planned for small meetings controlled by officers, their families and friends leaving the few outsiders attending a losing vote. All in all urban renewal is simply an overall blindfold for taking away from the poor hardworking taxpayer his home, his health and happiness something he had planned for 50 or 60 years and his descendants also planned on for their old age. This project is the most heartless move, not being warranted.

Sincerely for your success,
Mrs. EVELYN MERCER CALLAHAN.

HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to join with many of my colleagues in introducing a bill entitled "the Human Investment Act of 1965." I surely agree that private enterprise, when given the incentive, can conduct job training more effectively, more efficiently, and more dependably than can the Government.

This bill would provide an employer with a 7-percent tax credit, within certain limitations, toward training and retraining expenses for employees and prospective employees.

The measure would enable an employer to retrain any of his employees who were about to be displaced by automation or mechanization, and it would enable him to train new employees for job skills needed within that particular industry.

A substantial amount of our present unemployment is not due to a lack of available jobs, but due to a large portion of our manpower being untrained in the skills that are actually in serious demand at any given moment.

This bill would work hand in hand with the Manpower Development and Training Act, providing on-the-spot training in the industries where it is needed. The two programs would com-

plement each other and would lead to greater utilization of our labor force. It is, indeed, a human investment.

LIQUIDITY AND DEBT IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding characteristics of the current economic expansion is the rapid growth in total liquid assets in the economy accompanied by a sharp rise in debt obligations and a widespread concern over the quality of credit being extended today. These issues are discussed in an intelligent and scholarly article by Herbert E. Neil, Jr., associate economist with the Harris Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago.

During the past 4½ years, liquid assets have grown by 40 percent or at the highest rate since World War II. The public's liquid assets rose as much from 1961 through 1964 as during the 12 previous years.

It is this remarkable growth in liquid assets which causes many economists to see serious inflationary dangers in the economy today. Altogether, liquid assets and marketable securities total \$1.1 trillion which could be quickly poured into the spending stream. In a period of high demand, any substantial conversion of these assets to cash might very well have inflationary consequences similar to those which followed World War II. It is interesting to note that practically all of the growing liquidity during this period was concentrated in the household sector of the economy. Corporations are actually less liquid today than they were in 1960.

Along with rising liquid assets goes rising debt. Net public and private debt, which advanced by 32 percent between December 1960 and December 1964, today totals \$1.2 trillion.

The most dramatic growth has been in the individual and noncorporate sector. Between 1960 and 1964, the debt in this category rose by 46 percent. Individual debt now is the largest component of total debt. Consumer credit has also risen sharply in the 4-year period, having increased by \$20 billion or 37 percent.

The danger here is that a high volume of debt could intensify a recession if debtors are forced to curtail expenditures in order to meet their payments during a period of declining incomes. Individual indebtedness has advanced at a much faster rate—46 percent—than disposable personal income which is up only 25 percent over the past 4 years. Repayments of installment credit took 14.4 percent of disposable personal income in the second quarter of 1965. Many debtors, of

course, hold substantial liquid assets, but for many others this is not the case.

In diagnosing the state of the economy, I feel that the administration, as well as many private economists, has paid insufficient attention to liquidity and debt. Mr. Neil's balanced article makes a highly useful contribution to our understanding of what has been happening in this important area, and I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

LIQUIDITY AND DEBT

(By Herbert E. Neil, Jr.)

Questions concerning the liquidity and the debt position of the overall U.S. economy and particular sectors within the economy have been raised in recent months. Growth in total liquid assets continues following 4½ years of rapid expansion during the longest peacetime advance in American business activity. However, the liquidity of corporations, including financial institutions, has declined relative to the sharp rise in business liabilities. At the same time, debt obligations of consumers, businesses and governments increased rapidly, leading to considerable concern as to the quality of credit being extended today. An analysis of the sharp advance in the financial portion of the Nation's balance sheet, assets and liabilities, will be pursued in this article together with its implications for the future economic health of the country.

I. LIQUID ASSET GROWTH

A 4½-year economic advance, an expansive monetary policy, and higher saving rates have led to an accelerated growth in liquid assets since 1960. Rising incomes, augmented on an after tax basis by the reduction in tax rates in 1964 and 1965, provided individuals with increased purchasing power to step up their saving. The Federal Reserve has steadily increased bank reserves for 5 years, enabling commercial banks to create additional deposits. At the same time, banks and savings and loan associations encouraged the public to augment their liquid assets through offering higher interest and dividend rates, respectively. Moreover, to the extent that depositors are attracted to time as opposed to demand deposits the commercial banks are able to accelerate deposit growth because of the lower reserve requirements on the former.

A. Volume of new liquid assets

Liquid asset growth during the past 4½ years has been the most rapid since World War II. Since the end of 1960, liquid assets held by the public—currency, demand deposits, time deposits, savings and loan shares, and U.S. Government savings bonds—have advanced over \$140 billion, 40 percent, to \$500 billion. The public's liquid assets in dollar terms rose as much in the 4 years, 1961 through 1964, as during the previous 12 years.

An acceleration in the expansion of commercial bank deposits has been primarily responsible for the recent 8 percent annual rate of growth in liquid assets, twice the previous postwar rate of advance. Demand deposits and currency in the hands of the public increased \$18.3 billion from December 1960 to December 1964, after showing a nominal \$3.8 billion rise in the previous 4 years. Time deposits of commercial banks registered a dramatic advance—\$54 billion, 74 percent, from 1960 to 1964 versus \$21.1 billion, 41 percent, during the previous 4 years. The public also accelerated the pace at which it increased its holdings of mutual savings bank time deposits from 21 to 35 percent, but the dollar amount was small—\$12.8 billion—relative to the commercial bank gain. Nearly \$40 billion of the liquid asset growth between

1960 and 1964 took the form of savings and loan shares, but there was little change in the percentage increase from the 1956-60 period, 64 percent compared with 67 percent. U.S. Government savings bonds in the hands of the public went up \$2.9 billion between 1960 and 1964 after declining \$8.9 billion from 1955 to 1960.

The sharp advance in time deposits at both commercial and mutual savings banks in the past 4½ years reflects the higher rates offered to savers by these institutions. Moreover, savings and loan associations increased their dividend rates during the 1960-64 period in order to maintain their postwar expansion in the face of the more intense competition for savings from the banks. Promotion of savings by banks and savings and loan associations thus expanded the savings market and accelerated the rate of growth in liquid assets. Increases in savings type accounts have occurred partially at the expense of investment by individuals in corporate bonds and stocks. Individuals show a net disinvestment in corporate securities in each of the last 3 years, as liquidation of direct common stock holdings more than offset net purchases of mutual funds.

Following a slackened rate of demand deposit growth in the late 1950's, commercial banks pursued a more vigorous policy of seeking new time deposits in the 1960's. Indicative of the growing importance which time deposits were to play in the 1960's was the offering in early 1961 by several large commercial banks in New York City of negotiable time certificates of deposit in readily marketable form to their corporate depositors. Negotiable time certificates of deposits tripled in 1961 alone from slightly over \$1 billion to \$3.2 billion and then doubled again in 1962. Liberalization of regulation Q on January 1, 1962, which allowed commercial banks to raise their rates on savings deposits from 3 percent to 4 percent for 1-year money and to 3½ percent for deposits of less than 1 year sparked a record growth of \$15.6 billion, 19 percent, in time deposits of commercial banks in 1962. Mutual savings banks also raised rates, increasing their time deposits from a net inflow of \$1.9 billion in 1961 to \$3.1 billion in 1962. At the same time many savings and loan associations across the country upped their dividend rates so as to maintain their growth rate during 1962 close to the 14 percent pace of 1958 through 1961.

Lifting of the ceiling rate to 4 percent on time deposits other than savings deposits of 90-days to 1-year maturity in July 1963, led to a gain of nearly \$4 billion in time certificate of deposits in 1963 and a total commercial bank time deposit growth of \$14.8 billion, only slightly under the record 1962 advance. Mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations showed no slackening in growth, as they recorded increases of \$3.3 billion deposits and \$11.1 billion shares, respectively, in 1963. A further liberalization of regulation Q in November 1964 permitted commercial banks to pay 4 percent on all savings deposits, 4½ percent on other time deposits of at least 90-day maturity and 4 percent on under 90-day time certificates of deposit. Time deposits of commercial banks rose another \$14.2 billion in 1964, moderately under the 1962 and 1963 inflows. The dollar gain in savings and loan shares also slackened slightly in 1964, the first annual decline in net inflow since 1957, from \$11.1 billion to \$10.5 billion. However, mutual savings banks registered a record gain in deposits for the third straight year, \$4.2 billion in 1964.

B. Economic implications of liquid asset growth

The massive rise in liquid assets since 1960 has brought forth warnings from some analysts as to the inflationary threat of a 40 percent expansion in liquid assets in the last 4½ years. Moreover, this increase does not include a nearly 50 percent rise during the same period in the value of marketable securities—U.S. Government obligations other than savings bonds, State and local government debt instruments, and corporate bonds and stocks—of individuals largely due to rising stock prices. With over \$400 billion of liquid assets and nearly \$700 billion of marketable securities—mostly liquid—in their portfolios, individuals could transfer a large volume of asset holdings quickly into the spending stream. The sharp rise in liquid assets during World War II no doubt contributed to the consumer spending spree following the war which in turn abetted inflation when price controls were discontinued.

Inflationary pressure generated from the liquid asset expansion of recent years, however, is far less acute than in the latter half of the 1940's. No backlog of unfilled needs for consumer goods, especially durables, exists today as was the case in 1945 after 15 years of curtailed purchases. Most manufacturers are steadily adding to their capacity for future needs and could increase production if demand were to rise. In contrast, the problems of reconversion, obsolete plants, and a shortage of labor limited the supply of goods which manufacturers could produce to fill the insistent demands of consumers in the immediate postwar period. Prices were forced up as individuals attempted to buy a limited supply of commodities with their rising incomes and large liquid asset holdings. In the 4-year period, December 1960 to December 1964, while liquid assets were rising sharply consumer prices advanced only 1.2 percent per year compared with an annual increase of 2.1 percent during the previous 5 years. The somewhat faster upward movement in consumer prices this spring reflects sharply higher food prices associated with reduced supplies of a number of farm commodities.

Liquid asset growth is spurred by increases in the number of both high income and older people. As shown in Table 1, liquid assets rise at a faster rate than income, with spending units receiving incomes of over \$15,000 typically holding checking accounts, savings accounts, and U.S. savings bonds in excess of \$5,000. Families with incomes of \$15,000 and over advanced dramatically between 1960 and 1964, from 3.7 percent to 6.3 percent of all U.S. families (excluding spending units headed by a single person). Moreover, the \$10,000 to \$15,000 income families increased to 16.2 percent of all families in 1964 from 10.6 percent in 1960. Since families with incomes of \$10,000 and over have been the fastest growing income classes, a ready market for liquid assets has been available to savings institutions. Although their incomes are generally lower, spending units headed by persons 65 or older typically hold nearly three times as many liquid assets as the average spending unit. In the age category 45 to 64 these assets generally run 60 to 70 percent above the average for the Nation. Both of the older age groups increased in number between 1960 and 1965, with the 45 to 64 population group up from 36.2 million to 39 million and the 65 or over class from 16.7 million to over 18.1 million. Assets in the hands of higher income and older individuals pose less of an inflationary threat because of the strong willingness of these people to invest their funds in this form.

TABLE 1.—Liquid asset holdings by income and age groups, 1963

	Percentage distribution	Median liquid assets
Income of spending unit:		
Under \$1,000.....	5	0
\$1,000 to \$1,999.....	11	0
\$2,000 to \$2,999.....	11	\$75
\$3,000 to \$3,999.....	9	160
\$4,000 to \$4,999.....	10	330
\$5,000 to \$5,999.....	10	255
\$6,000 to \$7,499.....	14	465
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	14	880
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	12	1,485
\$15,000 or more.....	4	5,375
All spending units.....	100	440
Age of head of spending unit:		
18 to 24.....	11	145
25 to 34.....	18	255
35 to 44.....	21	450
45 to 54.....	18	710
55 to 64.....	16	765
65 or older.....	16	1,215
All spending units.....	100	440

NOTE.—Liquid assets include checking accounts, savings accounts, and nonmarketable U.S. savings bonds.

Source: University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

Large liquid asset holdings which could be injected into the spending stream initiating an inflation are conversely a positive force in times of cyclical downturns. Individuals owning bank deposits, savings and loan shares, and U.S. savings bonds can easily liquidate these assets if their incomes decline and maintain a previous level of expenditures. Individual portfolios of liquid assets of approximately \$410 billion today are equal to nearly 1 year of disposable personal income, \$455 billion. Compared with a liquid asset/income ratio of over 90 percent today, the ratio was 83 percent at the time of the last recession in 1960. Liquid assets thus provide a rather important stabilizing factor limiting the magnitude of a decline through their favorable effect on consumer spending.

C. Illiquidity in the midst of record liquid assets

While individuals have accumulated liquid assets at a record pace during the past 4½ years, business has not participated to any great extent in this phenomenon. Practically all of the growing liquidity during this period was concentrated in the household sector of the economy. In fact, corporate liquid assets advanced at a much slower pace than corporate sales, profits, physical assets, or financial assets. Corporations are thus less liquid today than they were in 1960 when the rapid expansion in liquid assets commenced. In particular, bank loans expanded at an unprecedented rate for such an extensive period. Concern as to the illiquidity of commercial banks, which contributed so significantly to the growth in liquid assets of individuals, reflects recent trends in bank portfolios.

Despite the sharp increase in time certificates of deposits cited earlier, corporations have added little to their total liquid assets since 1960. Time deposits of corporations increased over \$11 billion in the 4 years 1961-64 from a nominal \$2.3 billion, but corporate holdings of currency and demand deposits have been unchanged. Moreover, nonfinancial corporations sold on net \$1.5 billion of their \$20 billion portfolio of U.S. Government securities last year following 3 years of nominal variation. Corporations own fewer Government securities than at any time since 1950. Total liquid assets—currency, demand deposits, time deposits, and

U.S. Government securities—of nonfinancial corporations thus grew only \$10.4 billion between the end of 1960 and the end of 1964. Meanwhile, other financial assets—primarily receivables, finance paper, foreign portfolio investments, and foreign currency holdings—rose nearly \$60 billion and physical assets by \$35 billion after deducting depreciation. Financial assets of nonfinancial corporations doubled between 1954 and 1964 but liquid assets advanced only 26 percent. Liquid assets comprised 24½ percent of total financial assets at the end of 1964 compared with 28 percent 4 years earlier and 57 percent at the end of 1945.

A similar trend of decreasing liquidity is evident among manufacturing companies within the corporate sector of the economy. Total cash and U.S. Government securities amounted to only 8.8 percent of total assets of manufacturing corporations during the first quarter of 1965, a marked decline from 9.9 percent only a year earlier and 19.1 percent in early 1950. The steady decline in the liquidity ratio of nonfinancial corporations during the last 15 years reflects increased relative investment in receivables and fixed assets. Corporations are currently devoting an increasing proportion of their available resources to assets directly related to their prime business activities rather than to the financial markets. General economic prosperity during the past 15 years has lessened fears of a major contraction in business and encouraged firms to invest in non-liquid assets where returns are typically higher.

Commercial banks, like nonfinancial corporations, are today concentrating their resources to a greater extent in their prime business activity and placing less emphasis on liquidity. Thus, banks have accelerated their lending to businesses and consumers and devoted less of their portfolios to securities. While total loans and investments of commercial banks went up 8 percent per year, between the end of 1960 and the end of 1964, loans, excluding interbank loans, advanced at an annual rate of 10 percent. Moreover, loan growth accelerated further in the first half of 1965 as banks experienced a strong contraseasonal expansion of loan demand. Loans made up 62½ percent of total commercial bank investable portfolios at the end of last year compared with 58½ percent 4 years earlier, and exceeded 64½ percent by mid-1965.

At the same time that loans rose as a percentage of bank portfolios, the new loans extended by banks were longer term and presumably less liquid. Between the end of 1960 and the end of 1964, mortgage loans of commercial banks increased 52.7 percent, a faster rate of growth than for all bank loans. Moreover, conventional residential mortgage loans advanced 62 percent during the 4-year period while the more marketable FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages held by commercial banks rose only 15 percent. The traditional type of borrowing from commercial banks, short-term business loans, is playing a smaller role in the present lending activities.

Further evidence of decreasing bank liquidity is apparent from an examination of the investments of commercial banks. U.S. Government securities held by commercial banks have fluctuated during the last 4½ years but show no upward trend. Compared with the end of 1954, banks hold over \$10 billion, 15 percent, fewer U.S. Government securities today, while their portfolios of other securities, predominantly less readily marketable municipals, are up \$25½ billion, over 150 percent. Moreover, within the U.S. Government total, commercial banks in recent years have been increasing their investments in bonds of over 5 years maturities and cutting back sharply on their

shorter term Governments. Mutual savings banks display a similar pattern of increasing mortgage commitments relative to securities during the postwar period.

Recent illiquidity trends of financial institutions, as evidenced by rising loan/investment ratios and a declining relative importance of U.S. Governments, could be viewed as increased vulnerability to future problems associated with loan repayments. However, the phenomenon can also be interpreted as more aggressive lending and investing policies designed to increase rates of return on portfolios. In following such policies banks, in particular, are channeling funds to many businesses and consumers who would not have been extended loans in the past. Financial institutions are thus contributing to the present business expansion by performing a greater lending role in today's economy.

II. A DEBTOR ECONOMY

Concurrent with the rapid growth in liquid assets of the economy during the last 4½ years has been an equally large rise in debt. This is hardly surprising since debts are the source of earnings for the financial institutions which provided the liquid asset expansion. Banks and savings and loan associations were obliged to seek outlets for the great inflow of funds attracted by higher interest and dividend rates. Acting as intermediaries, they have performed the function of placing the funds of savers in the hands of borrowers. Since the earning assets of financial institutions are predominantly loans, debts necessarily rose in tandem with liquid assets. Concern has been voiced as to the sharp increase in the volume and quality of debt, however, since a weak debt structure would impair the value of liquid assets offered by the financial institutions.

A. The volume of debt

The dollar amount of net public and private debt—excluding Federal debt held by Federal agencies, State and local government debt in the portfolios of other non-Federal governments, and corporate debt of affiliated companies—in the economy today is approximately \$1.2 trillion. Moreover, the rate of rise in debt has accelerated during the present business expansion. Net debt advanced \$281.5 billion, 32 percent, between the end of 1960 and the end of 1964, compared with \$182.7 billion, 26 percent, in the previous 4 years. Private debt accounted for 82 percent of the 1960-64 increase, rising 39 percent during these 4 years. In the public sector State and local government obligations advanced 42 percent, but Federal Government debt increased only 11 percent between 1960 and 1964.

Individual and noncorporate debt has provided the dramatic growth in debt of the past 4½ years. Between 1960 and 1964 this category rose over \$130 billion, 46 percent, an acceleration from the \$79 billion, 38 percent gain of the previous 4 years. By 1962 individual and noncorporate debt exceeded total public debt for the first time since 1935 when Federal debt was rising rapidly during the great depression. Individual debt surpassed corporate debt in 1963 and has now become the largest component of debt. Nonfarm mortgages paced the 1960-64 debt expansion, advancing 49 percent, with mortgages on apartments and commercial property up 80 percent in the 4-year period. The sharp increase in mortgage debt against apartments reflected the phenomenal gain in multifamily residential building. Private nonfarm housing units started in multifamily buildings during 1963 and 1964 were over 115 percent higher than in 1959 and 1960.

An 8-percent annual rate of advance in mortgages secured by single family homes

during the 1960's, however, is somewhat surprising in view of the lower rate of new units started. Private nonfarm single family home starts declined sharply from over 1.2 million units in 1959 to under 1 million in each of the first 5 years of the 1960's. Construction of more expensive homes in the last 5 years than in the 1950's partially accounts for the growing mortgage debt on single family homes, but a willingness on the part of financial institutions to make larger loans on new and existing houses provides a more fundamental explanation. Lower downpayments and longer terms have raised the size of mortgages relative to home values on new homes, while refinancing following sales of used houses and increases in mortgage balances of homeowners to finance nonhousing expenditures such as durable goods, education, and travel boosted mortgages on existing homes.

The other category of individual debt which shows a large increase in the current business expansion is consumer credit. It climbed over \$20 billion, 37 percent, between the end of 1960 and the end of 1964. In the previous 4-year period consumer credit advanced \$13½ billion, 32 percent. Outstanding installment credit rose at an annual rate of 10 percent during the 3 years 1962 through 1964. Moreover, due to record automobile sales consumer credit extensions accelerated further in the first half of 1965. Not since the immediate postwar years, 1945-50, have consumers added to their outstanding indebtedness at such a fast pace for as long as 3½ years.

Corporate debt rose 32½ percent in the last 4 years, only modestly faster than the 1956-60 increase of 30½ percent. However, corporations continued to make increased use of long-term debt—maturity of at least 1 year—in recent years. At the end of 1951 long-term issues made up only 41 percent of total corporate debt, but by the end of last year this percentage had reached 47 percent. The more rapid growth of long-term debt reflects the substitution of bonds and other long-term debt for new stock issues. During the 4 years, 1961-64, sales of stock provided corporations with only \$10.1 billion of funds while bonds and other long-term debt supplied \$37.2 billion. Stocks comprised a larger portion of external financing in the 1957-60 period—\$13.8 billion compared with \$28.3 billion of long-term debt. Debt financing has a tax advantage over stock issues since interest costs are deductible. To the extent that corporations secure long-term funds through the sale of bonds rather than stock, the corporate debt figures are augmented while stock in the hands of the public rises more slowly. In both instances the corporation secures funds from outside sources, but the legal relationship between the corporation and supplier of finance differs.

B. Distribution and burden of debt

Although the recent rapid growth of debt is high by historical standards and exceeds increases in most other economic series, the burden of the obligations to the particular debtors who receive the credit is probably more crucial to the proper functioning of the economy. If the individuals, businesses, and governments that took on the added debt are enjoying rising incomes or had modest debt initially, there is little danger in the record total of obligations. Conversely, if the debtors are likely to become overburdened by repayments in the near future, losses to creditors could rise sharply and in turn put a damper on the extension of new loans and further economic expansion. A high volume of debt could intensify a recession if debtors are forced to curtail expenditures in order to meet their payments during a period of declining incomes.

However, the repayment burden of debt has not been a contributing factor to the mild economic contractions of the postwar period.

Government debt poses no problem from the credit standpoint as long as tax revenues are sufficient to service the obligations or maturing debt can be readily sold to willing buyers. The Federal Government is in a rather unique situation since the Federal Reserve could be expected to purchase Government obligations which the public was unwilling to hold at interest rates or a rate of monetary expansion consistent with economic policy. In effect, the central bank stands ready to buy a sufficient quantity of Government securities to pursue its monetary policy of encouraging noninflationary economic growth. From a tax standpoint the potential revenue source of the Federal Government, national income, has been rising at a much faster rate than its debt since World War II. From a postwar low in 1948 net Federal debt advanced only 23 percent by the end of 1964 while national income rose 127 percent in the 16-year interval. Moreover, because the Federal Government relies to such a great extent upon the progressive individual income tax its potential revenue source climbs at a faster rate than national income. As an example, between 1964 and 1963 at the same time that personal income rose 60 percent Federal Government personal tax receipts advanced 78 percent.

State and local governments are not in as favorable position as the Federal Government since their expenditures and debts have been rising at a much faster pace, their taxable income base does not automatically expand as rapidly as income, and no residual buyer, such as the Federal Reserve, stands ready to purchase their bonds. Spending and debt of State and local governments have doubled every 7 or 8 years since 1948 while national income doubled in approximately 13½ years. Additionally, property and sales taxes which make up over 50 percent of State and local government revenue do not generally advance in line with income unless rates are raised. Retail sales, which provide the primary base for general sales taxes, required 16 years to double due to increased preference for services on the part of consumers during the postwar period. However, a rapid expansion of State and local government debt is sustainable as long as incomes continue to rise and taxpayers are willing to vote tax increases to finance the repayment of the debt. Reductions in Federal tax rates, such as the income and excise tax cuts of the past 2 years, in providing a larger disposable personal income tax base, can be expected to aid State and local governments in securing future revenue.

Turning to the private economy, the ability of corporations to handle their rising debt of the past 4 years appears to be quite satisfactory on a gross basis. Total corporate debt rose just under one-third between 1960 and 1964 while corporate profits after taxes advanced 56 percent and were up nearly 80 percent from the last quarter of 1960 during the first half of this year. The recent improvement in the relationship between profits and debt is a reversal of the trend during the 1950's. Corporate profits after taxes were slightly lower in 1960 than in 1950 while corporate debt more than doubled, with long-term debt up over 130 percent.

As pointed out earlier, corporations have relied to a greater extent in recent years on debt financing than on stock issues in meeting their long-term needs. This is reflected in a decrease in the percentage of stockholders' equity in manufacturing corporations from 65.8 percent in the first quarter of 1961 to 62.2 percent in the initial quarter of this year. An analysis of the importance of liabilities by size of manufacturing corporation shows an increase in the percentage of liabilities between 1961 and

1965 for each asset size class (table 2). The largest advances in relative liabilities occurred among small manufacturers with assets of \$1 to \$25 million and the large corporations of over \$1 billion. In the case of the latter, the rise is from a percentage well below the average for all manufacturing companies. Trade accounts payable and long-term loans from banks and other lenders are responsible for the sharp increase in liabilities of the smaller manufacturers, suggesting increased willingness on the part of suppliers and lenders to extend credit to small businesses. The high liability percentage of manufacturing corporations with assets under \$5 million might suggest potential danger, but the small companies have also enjoyed the sharpest increase in profits during the recent economic expansion. Thus, it appears that the substantial debt incurred by smaller manufacturers is credit-worthy in a period of high profits, but could cause problems in the event of a recession.

TABLE 2.—Liabilities as a percentage of total liabilities and stockholders' equity of manufacturing corporations by asset size, 1st quarter 1961 and 1965

Asset size	1st quarter 1961	1st quarter 1965
Under \$1,000,000.....	46.5	48.7
\$1 to \$5,000,000.....	37.5	42.2
\$5 to \$10,000,000.....	31.6	38.8
\$10 to \$25,000,000.....	32.3	38.8
\$25 to \$50,000,000.....	32.7	36.6
\$50 to \$100,000,000.....	34.5	37.7
\$100 to \$250,000,000.....	36.0	39.1
\$250,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000.....	37.6	40.7
\$1,000,000,000 and over.....	27.4	31.9
All asset sizes.....	34.2	37.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Individual indebtedness has unquestionably advanced at a much faster rate than disposable personal income in the last few years, with the former up 46 percent and income only 25 percent higher in late 1964 than 4 years earlier. Installment credit extensions advanced from 14.2 percent of disposable personal income in 1960 to 15.3 percent in 1964 and have recently exceeded 16 percent. At the same time, the repayment burden of installment credit rose to 14 percent in 1964 after holding just under 18 percent during the 1958-59 period. Repayments ran 14.4 percent of disposable personal income in the second quarter of 1965. However, the percentage of families for whom the repayment burden is especially high—over 20 percent of disposable income—has remained at approximately 10 percent since the mid-fifties. It is also apparent that a sizable number of debtors hold substantial liquid assets. Based upon a 1963 study by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, 51 percent of the spending units with liquid assets of \$500 to \$2,000 had installment debt and 24 percent with liquid assets of over \$2,000 were paying on installment contracts. Finally, despite the rise in total installment credit, delinquency rates are virtually unchanged from 4 years ago.

Income and age characteristics of the population suggest that debt as well as liquid assets will continue to advance rapidly during the next 5 years. At income levels under \$15,000, installment debt is positively related to income (table 3). The percentage of families incurring installment debt increases up to the \$7,500 income level, and the average amount of outstanding debt per family continues to rise to at least an income of \$15,000.

Installment debt is concentrated among spending units in which the head is under 55 years of age. Dollar obligations are heaviest in the youngest age group, 18-24. A contributing factor to the expansion of installment debt in the 1960's has been a 4-million, 25

percent, rise in the number of young people between the ages of 18 and 24 during the past 5 years. This group which borrows heavily despite below-average incomes will increase 4¼ million between 1965 and 1970. Consequently, the age characteristics of the American population appear to be conducive to substantial further growth in installment debt.

C. Implications of debt expansion

Although fundamental age and income characteristics have contributed to the demand for debt, the prime stimulus to a faster rate of debt expansion since 1960 can probably be attributed to an increased supply of debt offered by financial institutions, particularly commercial banks. A combination of rising bank reserves supplied by the Federal Reserve and attractive rates on time deposits, which carry lower reserve requirements than demand deposits, enabled commercial banks to expand their loan portfolios substantially. The result has been an increased relative role of commercial banks in providing both liquid assets and debt to the public. Moreover, the enhanced role of commercial banks in the saving-lending arena is no doubt stimulating competing financial institutions to introduce new techniques for attracting funds and for then lending the additional funds in their custody. In short, the financial community is doing a better job of bringing savers and borrowers together today than 5 years ago and will probably attempt to improve on this performance during the last half of the 1960's.

Due to the larger role played by financial intermediaries today, the total of both financial assets and debt obligations of the public has risen faster than real production since 1960. Equity ownership of both business and consumer assets plays a less important role now than formerly. The financial institutions are performing their specialized function of providing financing to consumers and businesses to a greater extent while the latter devote their resources to nonfinancial activities. This type of specialization is a stimulus to economic expansion and at the same time improves the efficiency of the economy.

TABLE 3.—Installment debt outstanding by income and age groups, 1964

	Percent with installment debt	Median installment debt of debtors
Family income:		
Under \$3,000.....	27	\$270
\$3,000 to \$4,999.....	45	545
\$5,000 to \$7,499.....	59	645
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	58	845
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	56	1,045
\$15,000 or more.....	39	(1)
All spending units.....	47	655
Age of head of family:		
18 to 24.....	60	810
25 to 34.....	68	685
35 to 44.....	59	710
45 to 54.....	53	655
55 to 64.....	36	710
65 or older.....	12	(1)
All spending units.....	47	655

1 Too few cases to estimate medians.

Source: University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

Benefits to the economy from the financial growth of the last 5 years are not without possible dangers, however. With the rapid expansion of both liquid assets and debt, a smaller relative share of investment is supplied directly by owners. The liquid asset holders of today expect prompt conversion of their claims when desired rather than a more uncertain longer run return associated with equity investment. Thus, it is crucial

to the enhanced role of financial intermediaries that their liabilities—liquid assets of the public—be supported by loans which are creditworthy—will be repaid under terms of the contracts. Financial institutions must not sharply reduce the quality of their loans in order to augment their role in the economy.

Although the quality of a particular loan must be judged by the financial intermediary making the loan, overall loan quality is largely a reflection of the state of the economy. A turndown in business will suddenly increase the likelihood of default on loans because of reduced incomes. With larger loans relative to real output, the impact of a recession upon loan repayments is likely to be more severe than in the past. Therefore, it is imperative that monetary policy be conducted in a manner which leads to economic expansion in a noninflationary setting. Since 1960 the Federal Reserve has pursued an enlightened policy consistent with steady business growth. However, with the increased importance of financial institutions, and especially commercial banks, central bank actions become even more crucial to the economy. Federal Reserve policy directly affects commercial bank portfolios and hence influences a larger proportion of the Nation's loans today than in the 1950's. Liquid assets and debts can continue to expand without adverse effects as long as a judicious monetary policy is pursued. Individual financial institutions are responsible for the quality of the loans they extend at a given time, but the overall setting for loans reflects the state of the economy which is strongly influenced by monetary policy.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH U.S. LABOR COURT

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11217, which would abolish the National Labor Relations Board and establish in its place a 15-man U.S. Labor Court, similar in many respects to the U.S. Tax Court.

Judges of the Labor Court would serve for 20 years, except that the original appointees would serve staggered terms. The bill provides for appointment by the Labor Court of 90 U.S. court commissioners, who would have to be lawyers to assume the duties of trial examiners who now hear cases for the NLRB.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the National Labor Relations Act should be interpreted by a judicial body that would not be subject to continuing day-to-day political and special interest pressures.

At the present time NLRB members are appointed for 6-year terms. Two of the five members of the present Board are not even lawyers.

Instead of operating as a court, it is apparent that the NLRB now looks upon itself as a policymaking body. Too often, in my opinion, the NLRB undertakes to write the labor laws instead of exercising the restraint of a judicial body with the limited function of interpreting laws made by Congress in accordance with the intent of Congress.

I would like to point out that my bill generally follows recommendations which have been made by the American Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, I would not contend that this bill in its present form is necessarily the perfect answer. However, I am confident that it points in the right direction toward reforms that are sorely needed.

MR. TURKIEWICZ RETURNS FROM POLAND

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, just recently Mr. Stanley P. Turkiewicz returned to the United States from Poland where he was the chief of American Relief for Poland—ARP—for 2½ years. Mr. Turkiewicz and his lovely wife are natives of Buffalo, N.Y.

On September 9, 1965, one of our local weekly newspapers, the Ampol Eagle, included an article covering its interview with Mr. Turkiewicz on his stay in Poland. I was particularly interested in his comment concerning the reaction of the people in Poland with respect to Postmaster General Gronowski's appointment as our Ambassador.

The article follows:

MR. AND MRS. STANLEY P. TURKIEWICZ RETURN FROM POLAND AFTER 2 YEARS

Mr. Stanley P. Turkiewicz, of 194 Townsend Street, returned last Friday night from his 2½-year stay in Poland where he administered as chief of American Relief for Poland (ARP).

Turkiewicz, 68, a former Buffalo city license director, and former editor of Polish Everybody's Daily at Buffalo, administered in Poland a food-medicine relief program subsidized by the U.S. Government.

Accompanied by his wife, Wanda, Turkiewicz was met at the Greater Buffalo International Airport by their three sons, Richard S., of 20 Holly Street, Eugene, of 54 Schreck Avenue, and Stanley, of the Townsend Street address.

ARP, a private organization with U.S. headquarters in Chicago, annually distributed food worth \$500,000 to needy in schools, children's institutions, and hospitals. Turkiewicz also added that ARP contributed medicine and medical surgical apparatus.

Mr. Turkiewicz noted that the people are very grateful for the work of ARP. In addition ARP makes sure that donations are properly distributed, only to the needy, and that recipient institutions know the goods came from America.

ARP launched its aid program in 1958. Distribution in Poland is made on a county basis from Warsaw headquarters.

IMPRESSION REVEALED

Turkiewicz noted that the "Polish people are friendly and outgoing to the American people." From his 2½ years' stay he observed that every fourth person in Poland has some relative living in America.

Concerning the Polish youth he reported that education is not limited to the wealthy. "Good scholastic standing and an earnest desire to learn is all that is required of any ambitious student," Mr. Turkiewicz said.

Mr. Turkiewicz was very impressed with the high standard of Polish culture prevalent in Poland. "The arts are booming. Almost any time one can go to an opera or a concert for less than \$1. There are many theaters and anyone interested attends."

FAITH ALIVE

"Although you might not expect it, because of communism," Mr. Turkiewicz continued, "the churches are jammed full. There are not so many pews as in our churches perhaps, and the people stand in the back and stand outside on the sidewalk for the services."

He said the recent appointment of John A. Gronowski, former Postmaster General, as Ambassador to Poland has pleased its citizens immensely.

A Buffalo native, Turkiewicz was president of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America from 1958-62. Turkiewicz felt at home in Poland since he speaks the language fluently and has relatives all over the country. His wife is the daughter of the late Joseph Slisz, an organizer of the newspaper her husband edited for 15 years.

REPUBLIC OF MALI

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the day in 1960 when Sudan proclaimed itself the Republic of Mali. This name, Mali, is a proud one in African history for in its greatest era, around the year 1300, the Kingdom of Mali extended as far as Timbuktu and Gao.

The philosophy of Mali's ruling party, the Union Sudannaise, is that national unity within the framework of a single party is necessary to realize the economic and social development of the country.

The government has therefore endeavored to diversify its international contacts, while maintaining a basic policy of neutrality. Meanwhile it has worked to strengthen its relations with its neighbors.

I am sure all Members of this honorable body wish to see Mali achieve its aspirations in harmony with other developing nations of Africa, and I am personally happy that we have been able to provide this important nation with modest amounts of grant aid and development loans.

I am happy today to extend greetings on Mali's Independence Day to President Mobido Keita, to the Minister of State Jean-Marie Kone, to Ousman Ba who is the minister-delegate charged under the presidency with foreign affairs and to the others charged with major responsibility in this vital area of Africa.

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER WASHINGTON

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been struck by the fact that so many organizations in Washington which are directly concerned with community welfare are strong supporters of home rule for Washington. This can only mean that groups which year after year have attempted to deal with the many problems that face this growing metropolitan center, have been brought by the facts of life to the conclusion that these problems can be adequately met only through a government responsible to the people who elect it.

Following is a statement supporting home rule made by Mr. Seymour D. Wolf, first vice president, on behalf of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, which speaks for 132 member organizations:

The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington is a volunteer association of 132 organizations, synagogues and institutions in the Greater Washington area, devoted to community planning, research, education, and community relations. The welfare of the people of the District of Columbia, and their freedom and opportunity to live a dignified human life with the full exercise of their God-given rights and the rights guaranteed in our Constitution, are a major concern of the Jewish Community Council.

Because of this deep concern, the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington strongly supports the principle of home rule for the District of Columbia. The continued denial of home rule to the residents of this city deprives them of elementary rights guaranteed to all Americans, robs them of one of the most important elements of human dignity in a democracy, namely the right to vote for those who govern so large a part of their lives. We consider that the Congress of the United States has a moral responsibility to pass a home rule bill to restore to the citizens of the District the dignity of the franchise through which they can choose who will govern them.

We believe effective home rule legislation is long overdue. Such legislation should permit the delegation by Congress of maximum self-determination to the citizens of the District of Columbia over their local affairs, and at the same time, protect the interest, and recognize the responsibility, of every citizen of the United States in his Capital City.

We support S. 1118, passed by the Senate in July, as fulfilling these requirements. Congress can, under the provisions of this bill, maintain its authority over the District as provided in the Constitution, and also free itself of the time-consuming details of purely local problems.

The Jewish Community of Greater Washington therefore respectfully urges that the committee report out S. 1118 as promptly as possible.

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY,
FLA., SUPPORTS H.R. 10513, 10514,
AND 10515

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, overhead power transmission lines are one of the major challenges to our efforts to preserve the natural beauty of this Nation. An ever-increasing number of power corridors is encroaching upon our dwindling open space; unsightly steel towers and high-voltage lines threaten a growing number of the finest residential communities with defacement and devaluation.

But the threat of these lines is not only to beauty. Overhead transmission lines are particularly vulnerable to storms and other disasters. The recent hurricane which devastated Florida and particularly the southern part of my State, including my district and that of my colleague DANTE B. FASCELL, and the Gulf Coast States, knocked down hundreds of these powerlines. In the process, whole regions were deprived of electric service at a time when the need was most urgent, and the whipping, charged high-voltage wires added still another danger to the lives of the embattled citizens. One of the deaths in Dade County, from Hurricane Betsy, was attributed to electrocution from fallen powerlines.

This is no criticism of the utilities serving the area. They deserve nothing but the highest praise for the herculean task of cleaning up and restoring service. But it does seem incredible to me that we should have to wrestle with this problem time and time again. How can it be that we, in the middle of the 20th century, should be capable of reaching the moon and harnessing the power of the atom and still use essentially the same techniques for transmitting power that were used when electricity was first developed for commercial use?

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and honor to have as a friend and colleague, Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York. Even though a novice, he has made an outstanding record for himself. Mr. OTTINGER has introduced three important bills which will help us to deal with this problem—H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515. The research and demonstration projects and the tax incentives for private utilities provided in these measures should give strong impetus to underground installations and help us make up for the time we have lost through inaction.

Not only do I support these bills, but I can report a growing enthusiasm and demand for action throughout my district.

Recently the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County expressed the strong feelings of the citizens of this thriving and populous Florida metropolitan center by adopting a unanimous resolution endorsing the Ottinger bills. I am pleased to present this excellent statement for the RECORD:

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLA.,
OFFICE OF COUNTY ATTORNEY,
Miami, Fla., September 16, 1965.

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OTTINGER: Enclosed is a certified copy of resolution No. 11120,

adopted at the county commission meeting, September 13, 1965, endorsing in principle H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515.

We appreciate the speedy manner in which you provided us with the bills you introduced in the House of Representatives on which we based the contents of our resolution.

We will follow the progress of your bills as we are interested in the final outcome.

Again, thank you for your cooperation and courtesy.

Very truly yours,

JOAN ODELL FRANELLA,
Assistant County Attorney.

Enclosure.

"RESOLUTION 11120"

"Resolution endorsing in principle H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515, authorizing a program of research regarding overhead electric transmission lines, to encourage use of underground transmission of electrical power, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax credit for certain underground electrical transmission lines

"Whereas H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515 have been introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable RICHARD L. OTTINGER, 25th District, New York, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research regarding overhead transmission lines and the effect of such lines on health and welfare, community planning and zoning, and real estate values and tax revenues; and to authorize a further program of research and development to encourage use of underground transmission of electrical power, and to undertake projects to evaluate the economical and technical feasibility of such transmission, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an amortization deduction and an increased tax credit for certain underground electrical transmission lines; and

"Whereas the people of Dade County have long favored the placement of powerlines underground, not only for esthetic purposes, but also for safety, and for continuation of service during hurricanes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., That this board endorses in principle H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515, and urges the Florida congressional delegation to support this or similar legislation making it more feasible to place power transmission lines underground. The clerk of this board is directed to furnish copies of this resolution to the Honorable GEORGE SMATHERS and SPESARD HOLLAND, of the U.S. Senate; and to the Honorable DANTE FASCELL and CLAUDE PEPPER, Members of the U.S. House of Representatives."

The foregoing resolution was offered by Commissioner Alexander S. Gordon, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Earl M. Starnes, and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows: Joseph A. Boyd, Jr., "aye"; Alexander S. Gordon, "aye"; Harold A. Greene, "aye"; R. Hardy Matheson, "aye"; Thomas D. O'Malley, "aye"; Arthur H. Patten, Jr., "aye"; Earl M. Starnes, "aye"; Lewis B. Whitworth, Jr., "aye"; Chuck Hall, "aye".

The mayor thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 13th day of September 1965.

Dade County, Fla., by its board of county commissioners:

Attest:

E. B. LEATHERMAN, Clerk.
By EDWARD D. PHELAN,
Deputy Clerk.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF MAIDEN VOYAGE OF THE S.S. "HOPE"

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day for Project Hope. It is the fifth anniversary of the maiden voyage of the SS *Hope*.

Just 5 years ago today this white hospital ship sailed out of San Francisco harbor on an unprecedented mission. For the first time a hospital ship was commissioned for peacetime duty under private auspices and finances.

Many persons had advocated such a venture, but no one actually put the idea into motion. No one, that is, until a Washington, D.C., doctor, William B. Walsh, launched the SS *Hope*, on September 22, 1960.

Two years earlier Dr. Walsh, named by President Eisenhower to cochair the medical committee of the President's new people-to-people program, decided that his dream of a floating medical center could best be achieved through a private organization.

Dr. Walsh's vision proved to be correct—in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea—where the direct contact of HOPE doctors and nurses with their counterparts on three continents not only elevated the medical standards of the countries visited, but also built strong bonds of good will for the United States.

Dr. Walsh conducted his worldwide programs through Project Hope, the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., of Washington, D.C., both of which he founded in 1958.

In 2 years he raised the 3½ million dollars in contributions needed to finance the first 10-month voyage, obtained supplies and equipment donated from American industry and recruited volunteer doctors who would serve HOPE for 2 months without pay.

With the mothballed U.S.S. *Consolation* loaned to Project Hope by the U.S. Navy and renamed the SS *Hope*, the veteran hospital ship headed to southeast Asia. The success of that first trip was heralded in the press and on both floors of Congress, as were the three succeeding voyages.

Statistically, during 5 years, HOPE's 900 physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians have treated more than 3,000 counterparts; vaccinated some 1 million children and distributed nearly 2 million cartons of nourishing milk.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, HOPE has given hope and dignity to the people of developing nations, and has kindled warm friendships for the American people.

Today the good ship *Hope* lies in a Chester, Pa., shipyard, where it is undergoing repairs and reoutfitting. After trips to Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the vessel next January sails to Central America for a 10-month mission to Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that when the SS *Hope* docks in Corinto, Nicaragua, next year, a nurse from South Bend, Ind., will be aboard for the fifth time. She is Ann Roden. Miss Roden not only is one of six nurses who have served on all four *Hope* voyages, but next year she will be the only *Hope* medical staff member to have served on all five.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to announce that this fine dedicated young woman will be elevated to the position of chief nurse, the top post among the 40 nurses that serve during the entire 10 months of a voyage.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Project Hope, its founder Dr. Walsh, and the outstanding Americans like Miss Roden, whose dedication to the cause of world humanitarianism has brought great distinction to HOPE and the United States.

IOWA'S STAKE IN THE EXPORT TRADE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a speech which was made by Maritime Administrator, Nicholas Johnson, before the Foreign Trade Bureau of the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce. In this very interesting speech, the Maritime Administrator points out the great potential for increasing our exports which is found in the State of Iowa. In cooperation with U.S. Maritime Administrator Johnson, I have called a navigation conference to thoroughly explore possible means of stepping up Iowa's role in the export trade for November 10 in the city of Davenport, Iowa.

Mr. Johnson's perceptive analysis is of great significance to the upper Mississippi Valley. Here is his excellent speech:

IOWA'S UNTILLED OPPORTUNITY

(By Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce)

"You know we began this Nation as a world of traders, and we still are. It remains surprising and even shocking that about 80 percent of our business firms have never yet entered into foreign trade. I think this represents a great wasteland of untilled opportunity that is open. I hope that over the next 10 years we can increase three- or fourfold the number of American shippers who send goods abroad," President Lyndon B. Johnson, remarks at swearing in ceremony for Federal Maritime Commission Chairman Harlee and Commissioner Day, White House, July 20, 1965.

There is one industry upon which the growth of Iowa's economy depends more than any other. Do you know what it is?

Corn? Livestock? Many easterners think there's nothing else here. And there was a \$1 billion crop recently—860 million bushels at over 80 bushels per acre. Iowa ranks

first in the Nation in cattle and hogs and second in chickens and eggs.

Manufacturing? Iowans, of course, know that Iowa increasingly is becoming an industrial State. Alcoa, Du Pont, Firestone, Monsanto, Procter & Gamble (to name a few of the 100 of America's top 500 corporations with Iowa plants) also know this is true. In fact, during one recent 16-month period over 8,300 industrial jobs and 300 plants were created in the State. In 1 year alone, the chemical industry is reported to have spent over \$140 million for new manufacturing facilities. Today not one of Iowa's 99 counties has fewer than five factories. These include an aluminum plate rolling mill, cellophane plant, and washing machine industry which are among the world's largest—to name but a few of the plants and factories beginning to take over the cornfields and run Iowa's manufacturing output up to something over \$7 billion annually.

Some might say Iowa's most important industry is education. No one of Iowa's 68,000 students needs to travel over 50 miles to find one of the State's 49 college campuses. Iowa ranks first in the Nation in functional literacy; 97 percent of its high school graduates score in the top half of the American college testing program. Iowa State at Ames turns out more engineering students than any other institution west of the Mississippi. Paul Engle at the University of Iowa at Iowa City attracts from all over the world students who produce more award-winning poetry and novels than those at any other university—to name but one of the university's areas of international renown. The State ranks first in the Nation in the total number of Ph. D.'s awarded annually per million population.

Agriculture, manufacturing, education—each is important to Iowa's present economic condition and future growth.

But if I were asked to select the industry upon which Iowa's future economic growth is most dependent it would be another: transportation.

Yes; transportation.

Peter Drucker, one of America's outstanding management consultants, says in his recent book "Managing for Results" that many manufacturing companies invest far too much of their talent in trying to cut plant costs. If they would examine their total cost picture, Drucker says, they often would find a greater opportunity for cost cutting in transportation and warehousing.

The same point can be made for the entire national economy. Roughly 20 percent of our entire gross national product—about \$120 billion—is spent on the transportation of goods and people from one place to another.

Transportation. That's the business the Maritime Administration is concerned with, specifically, the shipping business. Ships become relevant only where they are cheaper or faster or safer or provide better service. Today they are a useful part of our total transportation system. They will continue to be—but only so long as they continue to be cheaper or faster or safer or provide better service.

As Maritime Administrator, and as an Iowan, I would like to reflect on the importance of shipping to Iowa.

The Foreign Trade Bureau of the Cedar Rapids Chamber of Commerce may not realize what a select group of American businessmen are in its ranks. Only one-fifth of the firms of this country engage in overseas commerce. You gentlemen are among that small, adventurous and profiting band. I am especially pleased that in my own home State, 20 miles from my native Iowa City, almost as far from the oceans as it is possible to be in this country, you gentlemen are interested in expanding your markets abroad.

In 1963, \$243 million worth of export goods left our State, including \$74 million in food

products, \$44 million in electrical machinery, and \$96 million in other machinery. Cedar Rapids is one of the largest exporting cities in the Middle West.

Up to the present time Iowa's corn and soybean production has made its way into international commerce in a big way. The Agency for International Development and its programs abroad encourage further expansion in the shipping of agricultural products, and Iowa should have a significant concern in the success of U.S. efforts to market these commodities overseas.

A stake in the U.S. export trade—such as Iowa has—is a stake in the development of an efficient and capable U.S. merchant marine. Lower costs in transportation can mean lower selling prices abroad. This in turn means wider markets, greater volume, higher profits, and more jobs. Reduced costs and improved service in transportation affect the welfare of your companies and the economic health of our country far out of proportion to the accountant's entry in your books or an economist's estimate of the "transportation account" in our gross national product.

What could Iowa's exports have been last year if, for example, all transportation costs had been one-half of what they were?

Both Iowa and the Maritime Administration have a stake in more efficient ocean-borne commerce. With the over \$300 million in subsidy that the Maritime Administration pays out in maintenance of the merchant marine every year, and the comparable amount that Iowa has in foreign commerce, our combined investment in export trade is high. It makes good business sense to protect that investment by insuring that our transportation essentials are in good working order.

Iowa and the Maritime Administration should seek to find ways of developing an efficient, low-cost, fast, integrated transportation system. Let us consider transportation as a resource as fundamental to human society as water and electric power. Ideally, the ultimate, theoretical goal of a well-functioning economy should be to have goods immediately available to any willing buyer at any given place—and at the minimum possible increase over the factory price. We might describe our goal as "instantaneous, ubiquitous transportation at an ever-diminishing cost."

Isn't our present transportation system simply an attempt to come as close as possible to that goal, and along the way to find the optimum combinations of speed, service, and cost of delivery for each product?

How are we doing in developing economical transportation? One hundred twenty billion dollars of the economic power of this country is involved directly or indirectly in moving the raw materials and finished products of American industry from one place to another. Even the most wealthy nation cannot afford to put such vast sums of money to any but the most productive use.

Let's speculate. Suppose we developed an integrated transportation system that allowed half of this \$120 billion to be released for more productive use. What would Iowa's share of this \$60 billion "transportation cut" be? But the more relevant question is: What is Iowa's share of the consequent economic expansion going to be? For although the first beneficiaries of the cut would be the transportation-related industries—shippers, importers, and exporters—the benefits of increased sales in new markets, production, profits, jobs, wages, and availability of goods would quickly affect everyone.

Iowa has a large transportation network: well over 100,000 miles of roads; it ranks fifth in the Nation in lighted airports; fourth in railroad trackage (there is no point in the State over 13 miles from a railroad).

What is often forgotten is the role of water transportation. The same river which brought Marquette and Joliet to Iowa in 1673 is responsible for the establishment and growth of 12 of Iowa's eastern industrial cities—cities with 33 barge terminals. With the 9-foot channel Missouri River project, Iowa—the only State in the Union bounded by two navigable rivers—will have water transportation to Sioux City for the first time. Each transportation mode is essential to Iowa—as is research and investment in their continued improvement. But it is natural that I should choose especially to emphasize Iowa's increasing dependence upon ocean transportation and thus her rising interest in the problems confronting the American merchant marine.

Granted that those of us concerned with improvement in ocean transportation agree that measures should be taken to increase the productivity and economy of the system, what specific work has been done so far to meet this need? The Maritime Administration, in association with various private organizations, has taken or is considering (1) advances in containerization, with rail-truck integration as a major efficiency boost; (2) a proposed new system of barge-carrying ships, increased utilization of bulk loading; (3) an attack on the paper barrier posed by the some 76 documents often necessary to get export cargo through the export maze.

Each of these fresh approaches is potentially beneficial in the export business. Let us take a closer look at the proposals in turn and determine how each one may be advantageously applied to your concern.

Containerization is a primary hope for a new integrated high-speed transportation system from manufacturer to consumer. If a product can be packaged so as to take advantage of the uniform accommodations of the new container truck-rail-ship system, cost savings can be dramatic. They are already proving out.

If you are a shipper with a large door-to-door volume, container may be the cost saver and the sales expanding technique you need. Savings are easy to point out: less danger of pilferage or breakage, lower packaging costs, easier transfer between modes of transportation (railroad to ship to truck, for example), lower insurance rates and, of course, substantially reduced handling costs.

While containers may not be less expensive on all counts than conventional shipping methods, it is as a part of an overall distribution complex that they bring the greatest savings. Distribution costs loom over the exporter on internationally competitive goods as the "make or break" aspect of sales.

For certain types of shippers, the container savings will be even more significant. In a recent study of the cost of transporting military subsistence from a U.S. inland depot to Goose Bay, Labrador, the average cost differential between packing the goods for domestic use or export was about \$12 per measurement ton. Sheathed unit loads or containers, it was found, gave the needed protection to permit domestic packing standards and allow savings of more than a third of the average export packaging costs.

We can extend the application of standardization and its efficiency to other areas of the export business as well. If we have standard cargo holds aboard ships designed especially to stow standard containers, we have efficient, economical use of space, and appreciable savings to the shipper and the operator. The Maritime Administration has encouraged the development of more efficiently designed, all-purpose cargo ships, suitable for carriage of both containerized and conventional cargo. The industry's response has been encouraging. Work has already begun by American Export Isbrandtsen Lines toward the world's first international container-ship service. The converted ships

will carry 738 containers, with a net container capacity of 812,000 cubic feet. This increased shipping capability is a major step toward the integrated transportation system we look forward to: A system of door-to-door service from our factories to the buyer overseas.

Other proposals for increased productivity in shipping have included barge-carrying ships. This system opens up possibilities for countless towns on lakes and rivers flowing to the ocean to become a seaport, for barges can be preloaded inland at the exporter's plant, and floated down a river, canal, or lake to a central pickup port such as New Orleans or Chicago.

Each of Iowa's Mississippi and Missouri River cities is a potential ocean port once the barge-carrying ship proposal becomes reality. Barges will be loaded and unloaded in Iowa's cities, floated down the rivers, loaded on to the barge-carrying ships, and carried overseas. Iowa's total of 15,000 miles of rivers and streams might very well add other ocean port Iowa cities to this system.

Barge carriers would greatly increase the economic feasibility and practicality of container shipping from Iowa to foreign markets. While not all cargo out of the Midwest is suited for container loading there are possibilities that Iowa exports such as corn, soybeans, vegetable oils and fats, and feeds can be containerized.

On trade route 13, gulf coast to Mediterranean, last year, bulk carrier records show that we exported 300,960 tons of soybeans—but none on U.S. ships; 195,540 tons of animal feeds—but none on U.S. ships; 20,545 tons of vegetable oils and fats—but none on U.S. ships.

Obviously, both Iowa and the United States would benefit if these cargoes were carried by a competitive U.S. bulk fleet. An efficient fleet means savings to you.

It means service in time of emergencies. It brings protection from foreign rate hikes.

It further benefits the economy of your country through balance of payments.

The bulk-carrier fleet offers great economic potential. It will require development and support—and it is very much in your interest, as cost-conscious businessmen, that you become an active part of that essential support.

But this carries us only as far as a loaded ship ready for departure. To get the cargo out of the port, the exporter runs smack up against what has been for many years one of the major difficulties in export cargo operation—the "paper barrier." This is the mountain of documents necessary to get the ship's cargo past the official checkpoints.

On the basic form for ocean shipping, the bill of lading, the shipper is required to give a variety of information such as destination, consignee, weight, a description of goods, etc. This sounds simple enough, and it should be.

Once more, however, there is the problem of lack of standardization. There are 300 variations of the basic documents used in the United States alone, and perhaps a like number in other parts of the world. They vary not only in layout and in necessary information; they differ widely in size, shape, and color. Furthermore, each one requires a varying number of typing operations to complete.

The Maritime Administration, working in cooperation with other Government agencies and with industry, has taken the first step toward breaking the paper barrier. With the possibility that 76 different combinations of forms may be necessary, it was obvious that the widespread use of a standard short-form ocean bill of lading could be a major breakthrough.

As a result of these efforts, a master duplicator form has now been developed, with eight related forms compatible with it. The

master can be filled out in a single typing operation, and the other documents quickly reproduced from it by many of the office machines presently in common use.

Early estimates by shippers and carriers appear to promise spectacular results from use of the new system when one considers that at the present time, on the New York to Southampton route, cargo frequently arrives at the dock before the paperwork is completed.

This is only one example of President Johnson's leadership in the drive to cut red-tape, reduce unnecessary Government regulation of business, and economize Government operations.

The savings anticipated through a document simplification program will only be possible through wide U.S. exporter acceptance. Your support of the program can mean time and dollar savings and a wider volume of sales, made possible by lower costs and faster delivery. The savings are possible—today—and as businessmen you should make it your concern to see that they become a reality.

So far we have discussed standard containers and standardization of documentation for more efficient cargo flow. Once this has been achieved, the businessman can add one more plus to his overseas sales program: the adoption of the standard quotation used in international trade.

This standard quotation is the CIF (price of goods—"cost"—including insurance and freight) quotation, used by businessmen in nearly every other country in the world. Yet 80 percent of American businessmen quote f.o.b. (free on board—or cost without insurance or freight at the U.S. dock) prices. Why the disparity? And does this difference make a difference?

Let us look at the background of the practice. After World War II, American exporters could more or less dictate the terms of their overseas sales. With the worldwide economic resurgence of the 1950's, the competition in foreign commerce has stiffened. The American exporter now must meet the demands of his customers, and the prices of his competitors.

A major service he can extend to the foreign importer is the quotation of CIF rather than f.o.b. rates on his commodity. The citing of f.o.b. rates means that the importer must go to the trouble of arranging for his shipment to be delivered from the exporter's port. When a foreign businessman receives, say, five quotations, four CIF and one American f.o.b., he may very well simply save himself the headache, and buy from an exporter with the CIF quotation. Thus CIF is more than a service. It is a major determinant of who gets the trade. It can mean the difference between a sale and no sale.

In the quotation of CIF rates the American exporter can gain certain advantages if he chooses American business partners. There are, as you know, three major areas involved in the oceanborne commerce business before the importer takes delivery of the goods: banking, insurance, and shipping. The U.S. businessman can protect his investment by being certain that he has control over every part of the transaction. American international banks can give the shipper the benefit of their years of experience in ascertaining credit ratings of importers; by designating an American underwriter, he can keep track of the goods and any claims much more easily than otherwise. By designating American-flag ships, the exporter can reap the benefits of the U.S.-flag lines' knowledge of their trade routes, their cargo handling experience, their international trade contacts, and the latest container-ship services at rates no higher than those of foreign ships. If the exporter is interested in quick transit he need only be reminded that the American merchant marine has more ships capable of speeds in excess of 20 knots than

the rest of the world put together. American companies call at ports around the world on regularly scheduled trade routes; you can be sure that the buyer's port is on call.

Yes; standardization is one key to efficiency and economy in the flow of commerce from U.S. manufacturers to markets all over the world. With standard containers and standard documentation, the businessman can realize benefits in dollar savings, time savings, and sales. With an integrated, efficient transportation system as a business asset, he can designate the most efficient, economical flow of his product, and easily give an accurate door-to-door delivery quotation.

The Maritime Administration has a great interest in seeing this sort of good business practice in oceanborne trade. The sea is a part of the highway of commerce from the United States to consumers abroad. Savings in shipping costs means savings to businessmen.

We have only begun to see what America can do in transportation innovation. A nation that can send two astronauts around the earth at thousands of miles an hour and bring them home safely ought to be able to design a transportation system better than the automobile, which imprisons millions of commuters for hours each day, and jeopardizes their safety more than any other mode of transportation. We ought not to have to look to Japan for high-speed railways, to Sweden for new shipbuilding techniques, to West Germany for small cars. All America has a stake in our Nation's transportation research and leadership—most especially Iowa.

Only last week in Washington I went to see what was billed as the "world premiere of the world's newest and largest freight car." It is the Southern Railway's "Southern 100"—an all-aluminum innovation in structure coupling, unloading, and suspension, as well as size, that can carry 260 tons of coal and dump 12,000 tons in 30 minutes. As Southern's President D. W. Brosnan said, "The car seems truly to hold great promise for reducing transportation costs and saving people money." He adds to this straightforward statement the businessman's observation, made to the coal producers, "You lose markets—and we lose business—when it costs too much to get coal to points of consumption." What holds true for coal is equally true for corn, soybeans, cattle and hogs, and all the many manufactured goods of Iowa's factories.

Here is but one example of what improved transportation has meant to one section of our country:

For years, agricultural economists have been predicting a livestock boom in our Southern States. This boom has been retarded by the high cost of transporting feed grains from the Midwest to the South. Recently, however, the railroads introduced the "Big John" covered hopper car—an early ancestor of the Southern 100—specially designed as a grain carrier with a capacity twice that of the conventional rail car. As a result, the rates on grain in the South have been cut as much as 60 percent. What does this mean to the South? It will add, in increased hog and cattle production, between \$3 and \$4 billion per year to that area's share of the gross national product. Think about that for a moment. An industry created where none existed before, at least \$3 billion added to our economy, and the standard of living for millions of Americans raised, all because somebody had the really rather simple idea that a larger car might provide a more economic way to haul grain.

Suppose, overnight, we had the equivalent of the cost cutting made possible by the "Big John" or "Southern 100" in every mode of transportation. What would it mean to

Iowa's economic growth, to your profits? What would it mean to America?

What would our exports be next year? Our gross national product? How many new industries would we create? How many jobs? What raw materials could we import we now cannot afford? How many new export markets could we enter with finished products suddenly competitive? How many plans to build plants out of Iowa, or overseas, would be abandoned? How much more cargo would move on American ships? How many more seamen would we need to do the job? How many pockets of poverty would disappear? How would the savings affect our economic growth—in the way our tax cuts have? (Our \$120 billion transportation bill is, after all, more than our entire Federal, tax-supported, budget.) How much extra leisure would come to us all?

Iowa has untapped markets the world over. It is your business and that of all Americans to be interested in means of cutting transportation costs in order to open up new markets overseas—and to bring to reality the President's prediction and hope of trebling or quadrupling our foreign commerce during the next 10 years. It has always been characteristic of the American businessman to recognize opportunity. I am confident that Iowa will continue to lead in America's coming upsurge in transportation innovation and overseas trade.

ATTEMPTS TO UNDERMINE U.S. EFFORTS ABROAD

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an address recently delivered by the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, before the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion at Portland, Ore.

Mr. WILLIS, in this erudite and well planned discussion, points up many of the things which are happening now, both overseas and at home. His statements are so current and so significant in this time when our soldiers are fighting abroad in an effort to block the inroads of the Communists and to sustain a free world that I think every American should read them in order to have a better understanding of what our present troubles are all about. Especially does he bring into better focus the unrest among our young people of the college level.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this address, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. WILLIS

Officers and members of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, it was a pleasure for me to accept the invitation of your chairman, Dan O'Connor, to address this meeting. Today I am going to talk about attempts which are being made to undermine our effort to defeat Communist aggression abroad and about the quality and the integrity of the education on which our survival as a free nation depends.

We are at war again today—in Vietnam. Again, it is not a war of our own choice.

And it's a nasty, dirty, and difficult war we are fighting there—similar in many respects to the Korean war in which we lost over 33,000 of our youth and suffered over 150,000 casualties. This war is being fought on two major fronts—the foreign military front and what we might call the domestic propaganda front. Great as our military problems are in Vietnam, we cannot afford to close our eyes to our problems on the domestic front—because they could have a bearing on our military operations.

During the Korean war, there was only one significant subversive group in this country that tried to sabotage our effort—the Communist Party. Some of the activities it engaged in were treasonous.

The same situation prevails today—except that the Communist Party is not the only group engaging in such activity. It has the support of many others. I would like to review some of the developments that have taken place in the last year or so which are highly disturbing to me and, I am sure, to you and the great majority of the American people.

The founding convention of a new national Communist youth organization, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, was held in San Francisco, June 1964. Since early 1957, when the Labor Youth League disbanded, the Communists have been without a national youth group. In the intervening years, they made several attempts to establish a new one. They failed each time. But conditions in this country have changed, and Communist strength has increased, to the point where it could succeed in establishing such an organization.

Several years ago, a new Communist organization, the Progressive Labor Movement, was formed by a small number of Communists who had been thrown out of the main Communist Party because of their ultraradical views. This organization of Communist firebrands has made considerable headway in recruiting young Americans into its ranks. At a convention early this year, it constituted itself the Progressive Labor Party.

At a conference on Socialism in America, held at Yale University in February 1964, which was attended by some 400 students, leaders of the Progressive Labor Party succeeded in bringing about the creation of the May 2 committee. The original purpose of this group, which is still controlled by the Progressive Labor Party, was to organize demonstrations in various parts of the country on May 2, 1964, protesting the action the United States was undertaking to prevent South Vietnam from being enslaved by communism. The May 2 committee not only staged demonstrations in a number of major cities on that day but, like the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, has since been doing everything it can, by propaganda and agitation, to sabotage the U.S. effort in Vietnam.

One of the leaders of this group, which has concentrated on student activity, has recently revealed that it is going to try to spread its influence into the labor movement for the purpose of doing far greater damage to our war effort. This is what he wrote:

"Students need not think they are powerless to hurt the Government's war effort. Every one of us acting against the war is a defector. But workers, a much larger segment of the population, are of more basic importance in maintaining imperialist wars. They manufacture the weapons of war, the machines that make the weapons, the metal that goes into them. They load, transport and unload them. They are a major part of the army. It is hard to see how a movement without them could ever be powerful enough to stop the war in Vietnam. . . .

"Production and transport workers still occupy the central position in the economy and will continue to do so for the foreseeable

future. A few hundred thousand steel workers, or auto workers, or longshoremen, or teamsters can paralyze the entire economy, even more so with the increased demands of war. Millions of salesmen, TV repairmen, white collar workers, etc., could not have an equal effect. . . .

"Because of their basic role in making the system go, an alliance with workers strengthens any movement."

The ultraradical Progressive Labor Party, which sides with Peiping in its dispute with Moscow, has been successful in setting up another important front—the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba. In the past 2 years, in flagrant violation of the laws of the United States, this group has gotten approximately 130 young Americans, the majority of them college students or graduates to travel to Cuba. While in Cuba, these students made statements viciously attacking the United States. They watched a moving picture produced by the Vietcong in North Vietnam, and cheered when, in it, they saw an American plane shot down.

In the spring of last year, one of the leaders of the May 2 committee set up an organization called the Student Committee to Send Medical Aid to the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam. This organization, again made up almost wholly of students, would aid the enemies of our country, the Vietcong, even while they are killing American soldiers.

In the fall of 1964, the so-called free speech movement was organized at the University of California in Berkeley. In December of last year it staged a massive sit-in at the university, leading to the arrest of almost 800 persons. One of the leaders of this movement is Bettina Aptheker, who is also a leader of the Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs. Moreover, she is one of the organizers of the Free Student Union, which has succeeded the free speech movement, at the university. This union is sponsoring a 5-day student conference at Berkeley which will open in just a few days—on August 25. Its purpose is to form a nationwide association of so-called free students. The Free Student Union has already drawn up its own bill of rights in which its members claim—and I now quote their exact words—"the right to govern our own internal affairs; to set our own standards of conduct; and jointly with the faculty to determine the form and nature of our own education."

It is not difficult to foresee the kind of agitation that will develop on our campuses about subjects to be studied and conduct to be condoned if a national student union is established under Communist leadership or influence.

The Students for a Democratic Society is a self-proclaimed radical organization which claims about 2,000 members, organized in 70 chapters, principally on college campuses. This group has become extremely active on the issue of Vietnam. It initiated the teach-ins, and organized the April 17 March on Washington, which was supported by Communist organizations of all kinds and brought about 17,000 persons to our Nation's Capital to protest our defense of South Vietnam.

A so-called declaration of conscience is now being circulated throughout the country. Sponsored by four radical pacifist organizations—the Catholic Worker, Committee for Nonviolent Action, War Registers League, and Student Peace Union—it is also being promoted by various Communist organizations.

What is the declaration of conscience? It is a document whose signers make five pledges:

First, They declare their conscientious refusal to cooperate with the U.S. Government in the effort to save Vietnam from Communist enslavement.

Second, They encourage all those who can conscientiously do so, to refuse to serve in our Armed Forces, or to ask for a discharge, if they are already in them.

Third, Those signers who are subject to the draft, declare their intention to refuse to serve.

Fourth, They state that they refuse, and they urge others to refuse, to take part in the manufacture or transportation of our country's military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development.

Fifth, They proclaim that they will encourage other nonviolent acts, including civil disobedience, to prevent American soldiers and munitions from reaching Vietnam.

Early this month a 4-day so-called assembly of unrepresented people was held in Washington. The call to this assembly was signed by a mixed group of radical pacifists, Communists, fellow travelers, and civil rights activists. Originally they announced they would invade the White House grounds if the President did not agree to meet all the signers of the declaration of conscience who were in Washington for the assembly. They also stated they would invade the Chamber of the House of Representatives in order to "deny that Congress has the right to declare war in our names." This assembly, too, won the endorsement of the Communist Party, the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and other Communist and fellow-traveling organizations. The thousand or so participants in the assembly, most of them young people, did not carry through on their threat to invade the grounds of the White House or the House Chamber. They realized that the police were well prepared to prevent them from doing so.

Some of them, however, did stage a civil disobedience sit-in, blocking White House gates. Thirty-six were arrested. The following day, almost 300 were arrested when they sat down on the Capitol Grounds and refused to move. It was the largest mass arrest ever made in the Capital of the United States.

On August 12, another demonstration took place—this time in Berkeley, Calif. Three hundred singing, chanting agitators, most of them in their teens and twenties, tried to halt a Vietnam troop train. Also on the same day, there was still another demonstration in neighboring San Francisco. It was held on pier 39 of the Embarcadero to protest the sailing of a ship carrying military supplies to Vietnam. This demonstration was sponsored by the Students for a Democratic Society, Progressive Labor Party, May 2 movement and Young Peoples Progressive Alliance of Napa Junior College, among others, operating under the name Alliance for Action.

Time will not permit me to go on mentioning other developments, most of them relating to youth, which are very real cause for concern. The important thing, I believe, is to try to find out what can be done to end this alienation which is developing among the youth of our country.

I want to make one thing clear. I am not concerned about the overwhelming majority of our young people who are completely loyal, completely American, in the best sense of the word. It is only a minority that is engaging in the activities I have mentioned. But, even a small minority doing things like this, feeling about their country the way they do, is more than we can afford.

The actions of these youths cannot be attributed to any one cause; a variety of factors have made them what they are. But I do believe that if we are realistic about it, we will face the fact that we, the adults of the country, are more to blame than they are. Somewhere along the line, there has been a failure in their overall education as Americans.

I do not believe that our colleges are ridden with Red professors or anything like it. I know it is not so. But the point is that even a few of them in some of our educational institutions are too many. And I have been struck by the fact that most of the young people who have been engaged in the activities I have described have been college students and graduates. They are not the poor, the underprivileged; they are not the sons and daughters of poverty-stricken workers. For the most part, they have had what is usually described as the best of our educational systems have to offer.

For this reason, I can't help thinking that our educational institutions, to some degree, have failed their students, specifically by placing them under the influence of certain instructors and professors whose devotion to this country and its institutions is, to say the least, open to question.

Why do I say this? Let me give a few examples of what I have in mind:

Eugene D. Genovese was a leader of the American Youth for Democracy and the Young Progressives of America, Communist Party youth fronts, in the years 1946-50, while a student at Brooklyn College. He was also a Communist Party member, but was expelled from the party in 1950. In recent years he had been a member of the editorial board of *Science and Society*, the Communist philosophical quarterly, and has contributed a number of articles and book reviews to it. He is currently an editor of "Studies on the Left", a magazine which welcomes left-extremist, radical, and Communist views of all types. He has also written at least one book review for the "National Guardian", and has spoken at a function of the Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyist Communist organization in this country, which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Two years ago, the Communist Party's official monthly directive, *Political Affairs*, denounced Genovese for his "ultraleftism." If he is too far to the "left" for the Communist Party, I do not see what contribution he can make to our educational system.

Yet, today, Genovese is teaching history at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. He was invited to join the faculty in 1963 after teaching at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute for 5 years.

Genovese was a speaker at the teach-in on Vietnam held at Rutgers on April 23 of this year under the sponsorship of the Students for a Democratic Society. In the course of his remarks that night, he made the following statement:

"Those of you who know me know that I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it."

Naturally, there was a strong reaction to his remarks. Demands were made that he be dismissed, but he was not. He remained on the faculty and is now helping arrange a series of conferences featuring Socialist scholars, which will be held at Rutgers next month. Inasmuch as they will feature a number of speakers who have been highly critical of the United States for years, it can hardly be expected that their effect will be to foster devotion to country on the part of the students who attend them.

Staughton Lynd teaches history to students at Yale University. Like Genovese, he has written for *Science and Society*, spoken before gatherings held under the auspices of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and is an editor of *Studies on the Left*. He was one of the initiating sponsors of a memorial tribute to the late Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, who publicly proclaimed several years ago that he had joined the Communist Party, and then renounced his U.S. citizenship to go

to Ghana where he died after doing what he could to help communize that country.

Following the assassination of President Kennedy, Professor Lynd took part in the Communist effort to clear Lee Harvey Oswald of guilt for his crime.

Professor Lynd has taken part in several university teach-ins on Vietnam. At the teach-in in the University of California on May 22, he referred to United States actions in Vietnam as "murder" and then made a number of suggestions. He proposed the burning of draft cards, refusal to pay income taxes, the establishment of a citizens' "war crimes commission" in Washington to review American crimes in Vietnam.

He made two further proposals: that there be a speak-in at the Pentagon and a congress of unrepresented people in Washington to protest the war in Vietnam. Both of these proposals were subsequently put into effect. He added that he favored civil disobedience in our Nation's Capital, because it would have "international visibility." The meaning of that statement is all too clear.

Other examples could be given, but I think these two are sufficient to illustrate my point.

It is sometimes claimed that radical professors do not use their classroom lectures for propaganda purposes. As far as actual party members are concerned, we know—because it has been openly stated in Communist publications—that they are ordered to use their classroom instruction for this purpose. Moreover, common sense tells us that this is what they would do.

As regards others, I would like to quote from an article published in a recent issue of *Free Student*, the publication of the May 2 committee which, as I have indicated before, is controlled by the ultra-revolutionary Progressive Labor Party. The activities of an English instructor at a midwestern university, a man I will call Mr. Blank, are described in this article. It is quite revealing of the manner in which some professors, in fact, work to influence students.

"Mr. Blank availed himself of every opportunity, and there were many, to speak out against U.S. aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

"Mr. Blank distinguished himself in another respect also. The time that Mr. Blank spent in class was only a small fraction of the time that he spent with his students. Mr. Blank enjoyed being with, talking with, and working with students. Mr. Blank punctured a very big hole in the wall between the students and the faculty.

"So . . . Mr. Blank was setting a very dangerous precedent as far as the university administration was concerned. He was attempting to undermine the cold-war mythology which is the rationale of the present-day university."

Because of his efforts to influence the university students in the above-described manner, Mr. Blank was notified that he would have to resign, or he would not be re-hired for the coming school year. But neither happened. Students and faculty members organized a protest movement in his behalf. They circulated petitions, planned a free speech rally and other more militant moves.

The administration retreated. Mr. Blank will be back at the university again next year and, encouraged by his victory, will undoubtedly continue his efforts to propagandize his students.

What can be done to correct this situation? As I said before, our colleges and universities are by no means Red, but I do feel that some of them have a rather unrealistic view of what constitutes academic freedom. I believe in academic freedom, and I am sure that everyone in this room does. But we must distinguish between academic freedom and academic license. Academic freedom does not include the right to use a classroom or lecture hall for psychological warfare

against the United States, for inciting our youth to sabotage U.S. foreign policy and violate the laws of this land.

I believe that many educational administrators would be more firm and forceful in eliminating questionable professors if they felt confident the American people would support them. Too often it happens that when they do act, a storm of agitation and protest is raised by Communist and radical student organizations and a certain segment of their own faculties. The great majority of the people who support the action taken, do and say nothing. The administration feels alone and outnumbered. It caves in to the pressure of the leftist agitators.

Some years ago, we faced a somewhat similar problem in this country. It had to do with the failure of our educational institutions to provide instruction about communism to the students of America, principally on the high school level. The American Legion saw the seriousness of this problem and took commendable action. It got together with the National Education Association, which represents some 900,000 high school teachers and administrators, formed a special committee, and drew up, jointly with the NEA, a pamphlet entitled "Teaching About Communism: Guidelines for Junior and Senior High School Teachers." This pamphlet has been most helpful, it has played a significant role, in promoting intelligent instruction about communism in our schools.

Could something along the same lines be done to help solve the problem I have been discussing?

Our universities must remain forever free to run their own affairs. But wouldn't it be helpful and reassuring for them to know that they have the backing of responsible organizations representing the American people—the National Education Association, American Bar Association, the American Legion, and the American Alumni Council—in enforcing a policy of true academic freedom in the best tradition, while refusing to permit any professor unbridled license in this area?

In view of the recent on-and-off campus, in-and-out-of-classroom activities of certain professors, could the Association of American Universities be encouraged to draft a statement on academic freedom and its proper limits with the knowledge that, in doing so, it would have the formal support of such organizations as I have mentioned and, if desired, any assistance they could render?

I urge that serious exploration of this possibility be made because, as I indicated in the beginning of my talk, we are dealing here with a problem that goes to the very basis of our continued existence as a free nation. In too many places today, in many areas of activity, we see flagrant violation of our laws, as well as failure to know and comprehend the basic principles on which our Government is founded—the concept of the rule of law and the preeminence of the law over the will and whims of any individual or group.

We can build, and are building, powerful military forces to protect our national security—the most powerful military forces in the world. But, ultimately, the security of this Nation rests not on the number or quality of our troops, guns, bombs, planes, and ships. It rests rather on the unswerving devotion of its citizens to the concept of the rule of law and their loyalty to the institutions and the Government created under our Constitution.

These do not come naturally. They are the product of education—education in the homes, schools, and particularly, with more and more people getting higher education, our colleges and universities.

We can be the best-armed Nation in the world and go down to defeat. But we will never be defeated if, seeing clearly the difference between academic license and academic freedom, we take steps to insure that our youth are not indoctrinated in disloyalty, but rather that, in all stages of their education, they receive the best that can possibly be given them in instruction on true Americanism.

POWERLINES AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the main thrust behind the drive to put powerlines underground is the growing national desire to preserve and enhance the natural beauty of America. This is an important goal and reason enough to act for, as the President said in his message on natural beauty:

We have not chosen to have an ugly America.

There are, however, a number of other important reasons for getting these lines underground as quickly as possible.

Overhead lines and towers are far more vulnerable than their underground counterparts. My friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER, has described the effect of the most recent hurricane, Betsy, on powerlines in the South and Gulf States. Each succeeding hurricane knocks down lines and interrupts service just at a time when electric power is most urgently needed. It is worth noting that it does not take a hurricane to disrupt electric service. A good hard thunderstorm can tie up the Nation's largest Metropolitan center as the following story from the Yonkers, N.Y. Herald Statesman of August 30, 1965, proves:

CON ED CLEANS UP AFTER STORM

After 45 hours of struggling with downed and shorted powerlines, Con Edison officials said that Saturday morning's storm damage had been completely repaired at 12:30 a.m. today.

The storm, which packed winds of up to 30 miles per hour felled trees and rattled windows in all parts of the county. Con Ed officials said damage was most severe along a line running eastward from Ossining to Mount Kisco. Areas above and below that line were moderately hit by the storm.

A Con Ed spokesman said that disrupted power service to 20,000 consumers in Westchester was reported in the first hour after the storm, at 3:30 Saturday morning. By 7:30 yesterday morning 1,500 consumers were still out of power, after a 1,000-man crew had labored through a full day.

"Every available man from Westchester, and a number of crews from New York City participated in the repairs," the spokesman said.

In all 300 lines, including 17 high-power transmission lines, 200 street wires, and 95 house-services lines, were felled by branches falling and high wind. Additionally, 10 utility poles were broken and transformer fuses were blown in 40 locations. Street light service was disrupted in 50 areas.

I share my distinguished colleagues inability to understand why, after years of experience and expense sorting out the lines and putting them back up again, no better alternative has been found or even given serious consideration.

Less generally appreciated is the extent to which these high-voltage wires are a danger to the lives of citizens.

Under a headline "Three Electrocuted," the Washington Daily News today reported:

Telephone repairman Ivan Edler was quickly killed by the surge of 6,900 volts when a weight he tossed over a tree at Mansfield, Ill., struck a powerline. Howard Lippincott, rushing to tear Mr. Edler away from the wire, was killed, too. Then his wife was electrocuted as she attempted to help.

Grim tragedies such as this are familiar to all, but they are only part of the story.

The September issue of the AOPA Pilot features an unusually informative and well-researched article dealing with another aspect of this hazard, the threat that overhead lines around airports pose to the lives and safety of pilots. This article is particularly important because of the documentation it presents regarding the attitudes of the utility industry and various Government agencies. From past experience we have every reason to expect the utilities to be insensitive to what they consider to be "other people's problems." But the indifference of Federal agencies such as the FPC and the FAA is harder to understand and impossible to justify.

I urge everyone who is interested in the problem of overhead powerlines to read this excellent article which, with unanimous consent, I now submit for the RECORD.

WHY NOT BURY POWERLINES?

(By Robert L. Parrish)

Although general aviation's ranks probably include greater numbers of utilitarians than esthetes, the majority can be expected to align with the minority on one current national issue—that of burying powerlines.

When President Johnson spoke out recently against the blot created on the U.S. landscape by overhead utility lines, AOPA and most light plane pilots were quick to agree that something should be done to rid the skies of the growing maze of those strands. But the reasons for ridding powerlines from view were vastly different.

To President Johnson and the architects concerned with the esthetic aspects of his Great Society, snake strung powerlines are distasteful because of the unsightly mar they place above the rocks and rills. To the light plane user they represent a too frequently unsighted hazard to life and limb.

The number of pilots who have found themselves ensnared by power or telephone lines before crashing to death or injury over the years cannot be easily calculated, but it is no mean number. Those who have undergone the heartstopping experience of colliding with the unseen but death-laden cords on takeoff or landing and who have lived to recount that terrifying instant can be found at any airport. Statistically, the powerline problem deserves more than passing notice.

In the most recent 2 years for which complete reported figures are available (1962-63), CAB records show that 293 planes collided with utility lines or poles. These accidents resulted in 66 deaths and 72 serious injuries, destruction of 129 aircraft and substantial

damage to 164. Although CAB's figures show that the majority of these accidents occurred in flight—indicating that they may have been the result of agricultural operations, or unwarranted low flying—a review of specific accident reports reflects that a sizable percentage of powerline entanglements occur during takeoff and landing phases of flight.

It is more than a little probable that reportable powerline mishaps represent only a small portion of those that actually occur. At a small rural airport near Washington, D.C., for example—which, incidentally, offers an excellent turf runway—nine pilots have tangled with a four-strand pole line that blocks one end of the runway. Only two of those accidents resulted in reportable damage or injury, but it is a safe bet that all pilots involved emerged with a few new gray hairs. And they have shelled out an estimated \$1,500 as a penalty for "trespassing" into the midst of those almost invisible strands of wire.

Since 1939, AOPA has waged a continuing fight to bring about the burial or removal of powerlines adjacent to airports, but with scant success. A study of the 1965 AOPA Airport Directory indicates that they are more numerous today than ever before. Out of approximately 8,300 hard-surface landing places in the 50 States, 2,366 list utility lines or poles as runway obstructions. Because the presence of such potential death traps is hardly a matter to boast of, it is likely that even more of the spidery sinews lurk in airport approach and departure paths.

Another factor that makes that 28½-percent obstruction figure appear conservative is the explosive infringement of suburbia on previously rural locations of some airports. Approaches and clear zones that may have been unobstructed by manmade hazards yesterday might today be liberally cluttered by the electrical webs that accompany demographic shifts.

In many locations, according to the Flight Safety Foundation, farsighted and public-minded utility companies have marked some lines considered potentially dangerous to aircraft. But in many more, the attitude seems to be "Let the flyer beware."

Until wires are marked by attention-commanding discs or made more visible by some process in original manufacture, the foundation believes, telephone and powerlines will remain the hidden quantity capable of downing an aircraft, sometimes as surely as if it had been shot from the skies. In AOPA's opinion, burial of lines in the vicinity of airports is preferable to marking.

Depressingly, until the President's recent fixation on natural beauty, there appeared to be little that could be done to impede the ivy-like spread of powerlines in the vicinity of airports. A few years ago, for instance, when the Potomac Electric Power Co. announced its intention to erect a high-voltage transmission circuit near Freeway Airport in Mitchellville, Md., FAA's Obstructions Evaluation Branch determined that it would constitute a definite hazard to the more than 100 aircraft based there and to transient traffic using the field.

Too bad, responded PEPCO, but that's the most economical location for our line. And that is where it went up. AOPA sought to intercede in the case, claiming that FAA had the authority to prevent construction of such a hazard. FAA's Office of General Counsel, however, didn't see it that way and decided that nothing further could be done.

The issue of overhead powerlines as obstructions to airport approaches has been a discouraging one to AOPA and other organizations in countless similar cases. In the late 1940's AOPA mounted a fullscale drive to eliminate the hazard by circularizing the country's leading utility companies. It was pointed out that the potential disruption of service and increased maintenance

costs posed by highlines near airports should be as distasteful to utility company officials as the hazard created by such structures was to the general aviation industry. Only in rare instances were those pleas even acknowledged by the omnipotent utility company czars.

When—as happened more than infrequently—one of the metal webs claimed the life of an airman or put his plane out of operation, AOPA flooded the community concerned with posters, boldly captioned: "Bury the wires * * * not the pilot."

In a few cases such postmortem, graphic pleas resulted in aroused public indignation that drove the powerlines underground or to new locations. All too frequently, however, the campaign met with more powerful propaganda from the utility companies and public indifference on the part of all except family and friends of the departed pilots.

The question of legal liability in collisions with powerlines is becoming more unsettled as increasing numbers of such accidents occur. A few years ago, the pilot was generally held liable for any damage inflicted on the metal threads. Wear and tear on him and his plane were unfortunate but not compensable through the courts, because obviously he was the trespasser who violated the stationary and therefore innocent powerline.

More recently, however, the scale of justice seems to have tilted the other way. Two California cases tested the theory of "absolute liability," meaning the pilot must pay for damage to powerlines, regardless of circumstances. In one of these cases, the power company sued to collect damages from a pilot who had struck its line. The court refused to render such a decision, pointing out that it was up to the utility company to prove to the court's satisfaction that destruction of the wires was caused by negligence of the pilot.

Insurance companies have pointed to that ruling with increased regularity and almost uniform effect in States that are not saddled with "absolute liability" statutes. In those States in which such outmoded laws still exist, strong efforts are being made to remove them from the books.

Through the continuing efforts of AOPA and others, the Federal Power Commission appears to have reluctantly faced up to the extent of the problem and the need to do something about it, even before the President's pronouncement on natural beauty. In its two-volume National Power Survey 1964, the Commission acknowledged that "Public insistence for placing (power) lines underground is increasing. Remarkable strides are being made toward reducing the cost of underground facilities. On one system, the extra cost in new (housing) developments as compared with overhead service is one-fifth the excess cost required in 1947."

Earlier an advisory committee to the FPC had claimed peevishly: "For appearance reasons, utilities are being subjected to increasing pressures to place their facilities in uneconomic locations, to install them underground, or to use more costly types of above-ground construction. If they are to continue in the future to supply adequate and reliable service at low rates, solutions must be found to this problem."

"On the part of public authorities this requires that they recognize the public interest in the economical distribution of electricity and resist the pressures from minority groups and special interests to force utilities to use uneconomical locations and forms of construction."

In another portion of the National Power Survey 1964, it is stated: "In some circumstances buried cables are advantageous, but the usual cost is 5 to 10 times that of overhead circuits."

"Likewise, there are technical limitations on the use of high voltage underground cables * * * and it is uncertain as to

whether present technologies allow for adequate insulation at * * * high voltages."

Nonsense, says Stanley Hiller, Sr., of Berkeley, Calif. An aviation pioneer who built his first plane in 1910, a noted business leader and inventor, he has waged a long and bitter feud with utility companies that claim underground transmission and distribution of electricity is more costly and problem-laden than overhead lines. To the contrary, Hiller said, underground cables can be laid at just two-thirds the cost and in one-third of the installation time for all utilities that overhead systems require. And the state of cable protection technology today is such that continuing maintenance costs will be greatly reduced by underground installation.

After retiring from the business world some years ago, Hiller decided to develop family land on the hills overlooking Oakland, Calif., as a housing area. He was adamant that the view of San Francisco Bay and surrounding cities would not be marred by unsightly powerlines and devised a system to consolidate utility cables underground. He set up a corporation, Coordinated Utilities, that provides installation franchises and engineering consultation on the subject. Since 1962, he has spoken widely on his single-trench system, with winning results. Community planners in various parts of the country are beginning to awaken to the fact that they have been hoodwinked for years by the power lobby's pressure tactics and reluctance to change.

When President Johnson last February delivered to Congress his message on preservation of natural beauty, the previously impervious power trust was shocked to its highest strands. He announced his intention of calling a White House Conference on Natural Beauty in mid-May, one subject of which would be discussion in depth of underground installation of utility transmission lines.

"It is my hope that this conference will produce new ideas and approaches for enhancing the beauty of America," Johnson said. "It will look for ways to help and encourage State and local government, institutions and private citizens, in their own efforts. It can serve as the focal point for the large campaign of public education which is needed to alert Americans to the danger to their natural heritage and to the need for action."

Just recently, Johnson got the opportunity to examine the other side of the coin—that of the hazard posed to flying by powerlines. In mid-July, a military helicopter making a reconnaissance flight over the area around the weekend White House at Johnson City, Tex., preceding the President's arrival, hit a powerline and crashed. A Secret Service man aboard the 'copter was uninjured, but the pilot and copilot sustained minor injuries and the craft was washed out.

The President's pitch for scenic beauty alone was enough to command rapid action. In May, Federal Power Commissioner Joseph C. Swidler announced the establishment of a national power survey industry advisory committee on underground transmission. The committee, comprised of representatives from 10 public utilities companies, was charged with investigating and preparing a report on the "state of the art" of underground transmission. Its report, to be completed within the next 2 years, is supposed to include an outline of the technical and economic problems involved; progress in overcoming those problems; and recommendations for accelerating research and development on the subject.

An argument put up by the power companies against undergrounding of utilities is that not enough research has yet been done to prove that underground transmission is either economically or technologically feasible. Yet, interestingly, a recent con-

ference of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers brought forth some 25 separate papers dealing with recent progress in undergrounding of utilities.

Chaired by Harold A. Peterson, head of the University of Wisconsin Electrical Engineering Department, the committee held its first meeting on May 19. Task groups were designated to report at a second meeting on June 23 on preliminary data being collected for an initial report, due to be drafted this month. Unfortunately, according to sources within the FPC, the early blush of enthusiasm that attended the urge to preserve natural beauty already seems to have lost much of its luster.

FPC employees who staff the project reportedly regard it as a low-priority item and expect the report—if and when it is completed—to merely gather dust on obscure library shelves.

With an opportunity presented now for the first time of possibly throttling the unbridled spread of these manstrung tendons of potential aeronautical disaster, AOPA is taking a firm stand behind the preservation of natural beauty through elimination of overhead powerlines. The lives, health and planes of general aviation pilots that may also be preserved or lengthened through such action are more than just incidental.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALI ON ITS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Mali celebrates the fifth anniversary of its independence on the 22d of September.

This vast landlocked country, located in the heart of former French West Africa, is a nation of brave and independent peoples who can trace their ancestries back to the great Mali Empire of the 13th century.

Once a quiet pastoral nation of farmers, fishermen, and herdsmen, Mali has begun to tackle the long climb toward modernization. Long self-sufficient agriculturally, Mali has begun new efforts, through the Office du Niger, to intensify cultivation and increase the stock of those agricultural surpluses that will enable her to build an effective local food processing industry.

Although she is making a concerted effort to build the industrial sector of her economy as well, it is to the credit of the Republic of Mali that economic growth has been expressed in terms of increasing the prosperity and well-being of the Malian people. In fact, in the realm of labor legislation and social welfare, Mali's accomplishments are equal to those of many nations which would otherwise be considered much more developed.

Although it has only been 5 years since the people of Mali received their independence from France, the efforts that they have already made, socially as well as economically, demonstrate that they possess the necessary resolution to make the difficult transition to modernization.

It is a pleasure for me to extend my congratulations to the Republic of Mali on this fifth anniversary of her independence.

BILL TO ESTABLISH ACADEMY ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to establish an Academy of Foreign Affairs for the United States. In this increasingly complex world, virtually every department of Government is concerned with foreign affairs in some way. With our worldwide mission of promoting peace and justice, of aiding other nations of the world to become self-sustaining and independent, it is essential that we have a well trained diplomatic force. It is also essential that we have an institution where we can coordinate the advanced studies of our foremost educational institutions in the field of foreign affairs. The Academy of Foreign Affairs, with its college and graduate school is intended to provide these services to the Nation. My bill should make the Foreign Service of our Nation a highly respected career, to be eagerly sought, with years of studious preparation.

Throughout much of modern history, Great Britain and France have been admired and envied for their diplomacy. Even when we may have disagreed with their motives, we have admired their diplomatic skills. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have just introduced is intended to give the United States of America diplomatic education second to none, and a growing tradition of high attainments of scholarship in the affairs of nations.

I would respectfully urge the earnest attention of my colleagues to this pressing problem.

MEANINGFUL HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House well know, for many long days and hours the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], and I have been engaged in a bipartisan effort to bring to the Dis-

trict of Columbia home rule which will be meaningful home rule to the District.

We have just introduced a bill which we believe accomplishes that purpose and meets most of if not all of the objections raised to the bill due to be called up on Monday next. At that time I will offer the bill introduced today as an amendment. I urge all of our colleagues to read the bill and acquaint themselves with its terms. We will in the meantime send to each Member a brief explanation outlining the changes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 317]

Abbott	Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Morris
Anderson, Ill.	Fulton, Tenn.	Morton
Andrews,	Goodell	Murray
George W.	Griffin	Nix
Ashley	Griffiths	O'Brien
Baldwin	Gubser	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Halleck	O'Neal, Ga.
Battin	Hanna	Ottinger
Belcher	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Berry	Harris	Patman
Betts	Harsha	Pool
Blatnik	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Bolling	Herlong	Price
Bolton	Hicks	Reld, N.Y.
Bonner	Holifield	Resnick
Bow	Holland	Rogers, Tex.
Brock	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Broomfield	Howard	Ryan
Broyhill, N.C.	Joelson	Schweiker
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Okla.	Scott
Cahill	Jonas	Senner
Casey	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Calif.
Clark	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Clausen,	Kluczyński	Stalbaum
Don H.	Landrum	Steed
Colmer	Latta	Stephens
Conyers	Lindsay	Teague, Calif.
Curtis	Lipcomb	Teague, Tex.
Denton	Long, Md.	Thomas
Diggs	McClary	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	McEwen	Thomson, Wis.
Duncan, Oreg.	McFall	Toll
Edwards, Calif.	McMillan	Tupper
Erlenborn	Machen	Udall
Everett	Mackie	Utt
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Vivian
Farnsley	Martin, Mass.	Walker, N. Mex.
Farnum	Martin, Nebr.	Whitten
Findley	Miller	Widnall
Fino	Mize	Wilson,
Fisher	Moeller	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has announced that without objection further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time seeking recognition.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I still reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the right to object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask whether or not it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; we have only two or three unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has yielded to me. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois will withhold that for a moment—

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. I do not think the gentleman yielded for that purpose.

Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I do.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the motion that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in his opinion the "noes" had it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. ALBERT and Mr. ARENDS.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 104.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 90, nays 204, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—90

Adair	Devine	Michel
Andrews,	Dickinson	Moore
Glenn	Dingell	Morse
Andrews,	Dole	Nelsen
N. Dak.	Duncan, Tenn.	Pelly
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Pirnie
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Quile
Ayres	Fulton, Pa.	Quillen
Bell	Gathings	Reifel
Berry	Griffin	Reinecke
Bray	Gross	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brock	Grover	Robison
Broyhill, N.C.	Gurney	Roudebush
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Rumsfeld
Buchanan	Hall	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Schneebell
Callaway	Harvey, Mich.	Shriver
Carter	Hutchinson	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Johnson, Pa.	Stafford
Clawson, Del	Jonas	Tupper
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Walker, Miss.
Collier	Keith	Watkins
Conable	Laird	Watson
Corbett	Langen	Whalley
Cramer	Lipcomb	Williams
Cunningham	McClary	Wilson, Bob
Curtin	McCulloch	Wyatt
Curtis	McDade	Wydler
Dague	MacGregor	Yates
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Younger
Derwinski	May	

NAYS—204

Abbt Green, Oreg. Perkins
 Adams Green, Pa. Philbin
 Addabbo Greigg Pickle
 Albert Grider Pike
 Anderson, Tenn. Hagan, Ga. Poage
 Annunzio Hagan, Calif. Pool
 Ashley Halpern Pucinski
 Bandstra Hamilton Race
 Beckworth Hanna Randall
 Bennett Hansen, Iowa Hardy
 Bingham Hathaway Redlin
 Boggs Hawkins Reid, N.Y.
 Boland Hays Rhodes, Pa.
 Brademas Hechler Rivers, S.C.
 Brooks Helstoski Roberts
 Brown, Calif. Henderson Rodino
 Burke Horton Rogers, Colo.
 Burleson Howard Rogers, Fla.
 Burton, Calif. Hull Rogers, Tex.
 Cabell Hungate Roman
 Calan Huot Roncallo
 Carey Ichord Rooney, N.Y.
 Chelf Irwin Rostenkowski
 Clevenger Jacobs Roush
 Cohelan Jarman Roybal
 Conte Jennings Ryan
 Conyers Johnson, Calif. Satterfield
 Cooley Jones, Ala. St. Germain
 Corman Karsten St. Onge
 Craley Karth Schisler
 Culver Kastenmeier Schmidhauser
 Daddario Kee Secrest
 Daniels Keogh Selden
 Davis, Ga. King, Utah Shipley
 Dawson Kluczynski Sikes
 de la Garza Kornegay Sisk
 Delaney Krebs Slack
 Donohue Long, La. Smith, Iowa
 Dorn Love Staggers
 Dow McCarthy Steed
 Downing McDowell Stratton
 Duski McFall Stubblefield
 Duncan, Oreg. McGrath Sweeney
 Dyal McVicker Taylor
 Edmondson Madden Teague, Tex.
 Evans, Colo. Mahon Tenzer
 Everett Marsh Todd
 Farbsteln Mathias Trimble
 Fascell Matsunaga Tuck
 Feighan Matthews Tunney
 Fisher Meeds Tuten
 Flood Mills Van Deerlin
 Flynt Minish Vanik
 Foley Mink Vigorito
 Ford Morgan Vivian
 William D. Morrison Waggonner
 Fountain Multer Watts
 Friedel Murphy, Ill. Weltner
 Fugua Natcher White, Idaho
 Gallagher Nedzi White, Tex.
 Gettys O'Hara, Mich. Whitener
 Gialmo O'Konski Willis
 Gibbons Olson, Minn. Wilson
 Gilbert O'Neill, Mass. Charles H.
 Gilligan Ottinger Wolff
 Gonzalez Patman Wright
 Grabowski Patten Young
 Gray Pepper Zablocki

NOT VOTING—138

Abernethy Denton Hosmer
 Anderson, Ill. Diggs Joelson
 Andrews, George W. Dowdy Johnson, Okla.
 Ashmore Dwyer Kelly
 Aspinall Edwards, Calif. King, Calif.
 Baldwin Erlenborn King, N.Y.
 Baring Evins, Tenn. Kirwan
 Barrett Fallo' Kunkel
 Bates Farnsley Landrum
 Battin Farnum Latta
 Belcher Findley Leggett
 Betts Flno Lennon
 Blatnik Fogarty Lindsay
 Bolling Ford, Gerald R. Long, Md.
 Bolton Fraser McEwen
 Bonner Frelinghuysen McMillan
 Bow Fulton, Tenn. Macdonald
 Broomfield Garmatz Machen
 Burton, Utah Goodell Mackay
 Byrne, Pa. Griffiths Mackie
 Cahill Gubser Martin, Ala.
 Cameron Halleck Martin, Mass.
 Casey Hanley Martin, Nebr.
 Cederberg Hansen, Wash. Miller
 Celler Harris Minshall
 Clancy Harsha Mize
 Clark Harvey, Ind. Moeller
 Clausen Hébert Monagan
 Don H. Herlong Moorhead
 Colmer Hicks Morris
 Dent Hollfield Morton
 Holland Mosher

Moss
 Murphy, N.Y.
 Murray
 Nix
 O'Brien
 O'Hara, Ill.
 Olsen, Mont.
 O'Neal, Ga.
 Passman
 Poff
 Powell
 Price
 Reid, Ill.
 Resnick
 Reuss
 Rooney, Pa.
 Roosevelt
 Rosenthal
 Scheuer
 Schweiker
 Scott
 Sennar
 Sickles
 Smith, Calif.
 Smith, N.Y.
 Smith, Va.
 Springer
 Stalbaum
 Stanton
 Stephens
 Sullivan
 Talcott
 Teague, Calif.
 Thomas
 Thompson, N.J.
 Thompson, Tex.
 Thomson, Wis.
 Toll
 Udall
 Ullman
 Utt
 Walker, N. Mex.
 Whitten
 Widnall

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TEACHING FACILITIES FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill that will provide grants for the construction of teaching facilities for veterinary medical personnel and establish loan funds for veterinary students. Although in the past we have provided support for training physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel, for too long we have neglected the needs of the veterinary student—a no less important member of the public health team.

Perhaps this oversight has occurred because too many of us still regard the veterinarian only as a horse doctor or as someone we call on when the family pet is sick. Of course, many veterinarians remain true to this traditional function. However, today's veterinarian is also engaged in a wide range of other activities which directly serve the cause of public health, safeguarding the well-being of our Nation's human—as well as animal—population.

Veterinarians work as meat inspectors, assuring us of wholesome meat and poultry. They are concerned with the health inspection of imported animals, the development and testing of drugs and biologics for both human and animal use and the care of experimental animals used in medical studies of air pollution, pesticides, radiation, space travel, and the effects of biological warfare on living organisms.

Certainly then, as specialists in animal health, well-trained veterinarians are essential to the life of any modern nation. And it is estimated that twice as many veterinarians as are practicing today will be needed in this country by 1980. This means a total of approximately 44,000 in 15 years. Veterinarians are needed in so many research and preventive medical areas that the present rate of graduation from schools of veterinary medicine must be substantially increased.

The American Veterinary Medical Association estimates that between 1975 and 1980 the number of veterinarians will

increase by 1,211 or only 242 a year—a rate declining in pace with the needs of the rising population. In 1980 even the absolute number of veterinarians will begin to decline. As the association has said:

With the continued growth of the population, incomes, livestock, products, and small animal numbers, the outlook for the veterinary profession appears to be one of rapid change and increasing complexity in the nature of veterinary medical service.

The association suggested, and I quote:

Stronger and more effective efforts than in the past will be needed to enlarge and expand veterinary education facilities in order to increase the number of veterinary medical graduates and to encourage veterinarians to avail themselves of programs of continuing education so as to increase their efficiency and achieve a higher output of services per veterinarian.

The bill I place before you today is a measure designed to help meet this need. In its first part the bill would authorize the appropriation of \$2 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years for grants to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel; and \$15 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years, for grants to assist in the construction of new or expanded teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel.

In a project for a new school, or new facilities in an existing school where such facilities are of particular importance in providing a major expansion of training capacity, the amount granted may not exceed 66⅔ percent of the cost of construction. In any other grant such amount may not exceed 50 percent of the necessary cost of construction. An additional sum of not more than \$25,000 may be granted for the cost of preparing initial plans.

Applicants for these grants must be accredited public or other nonprofit schools of veterinary medicine or if a new school there must be reasonable assurance that the school will meet accreditation standards. The bill also outlines certain other restrictions and considerations in the awarding of grants under this part.

The second part of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements for the establishment and operation of student loan funds with an accredited public or other nonprofit school of veterinary medicine. Each school receiving Federal funds for this purpose will be required to allocate an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of the amount deposited by the Federal Government. Loans not to exceed \$2,000 per student for any academic year may be made only to students needing such funds in order to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine. According to provisions of the bill, loans shall be repayable in equal or graduated installments over the 10-year period which begins 3 years after the student ceases to

pursue a full-time course at a school of veterinary medicine.

To establish these loan funds the bill further provides that the Secretary be authorized \$510,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, \$1,020,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$1,540,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any academic year ending before July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education. The bill outlines certain other conditions, exceptions, and consideration in establishing these loan funds.

In considering the adoption of the provisions of this bill, one fact should be remembered—animal and human health are inseparably and fundamentally linked together. Throughout history man has shared with animals the disastrous effects of epidemic diseases. Animals are also stricken with much the same genetic and degenerative diseases as man, and therefore any finding that may contribute to a solution of these animal problems may be directly beneficial to man.

I wonder how many of my colleagues in the House are aware of the medical advances of the past that were based on veterinary medical discoveries. These include the development of the drug used against human hookworm; the development of a potent anticoagulant drug which has helped save many coronary victims; the perfection of a method of anesthesia; and the observation that insects may transmit disease between animals and between animals and humans—a discovery that laid the groundwork for the conquest of yellow fever.

Today, veterinarians are working in at least 25 major research centers and many smaller laboratories with other specialists, seeking similarities between animal and human disease. Many grants from the Public Health Service and other Federal agencies support veterinary research in cancer, heart disease, gastric ulcer, and other chronic diseases in an effort to throw light on human pathology. Veterinarians are also on the forefront in space medicine and bioengineering.

These few examples serve to illustrate the scope of activities in which veterinarians participate. Because the achievements of the veterinarian are not familiar enough to all of us, the education and training of this valuable professional has been passed over in previous assistance bills.

The provisions of the bill I introduce here today are a sensible approach to a significant manpower shortage we have overlooked for too long. I have often in the past come before this assembly to seek its support for health manpower training, and have subsequently been proud of the fine record Congress has made in acting on these proposals.

Today, I urge each of my colleagues in the House to provide the veterinary profession with the same opportunities we have already provided for others in the health fraternity. With the public-

health team, the stakes are too high to warrant anything but full support of all its members. In the era of modern medicine, veterinary science has come of age in realizing and developing its wide-ranging potential. It is time for us, too, to acknowledge the vital role of today's veterinarian and to act swiftly to help meet his needs.

PRICE SCHEDULES OF GENERAL MOTORS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen all the details, but it appears that the General Motors Corp. in its announced price schedules for the 1966 models is living up to the hopes and expectations of the Congress and the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I understand there are reductions ranging between \$50 and \$100 which reflect our own excise tax reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the management of the company for its contribution to price stability.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HICKS, for Wednesday, September 22, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 60 minutes, Thursday, September 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. REID of New York), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. JACOBS), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. JACOBS), for 15 minutes, September 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. JACOBS), for 30 minutes, September 25; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JACOBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. IRWIN in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1357. An act to revise existing bail practices in courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to require establishment of water quality criteria, and for other purposes;

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 664. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Pola Bodenstein; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Betty H. Going;

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H.R. 4152. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4603. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 7090. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 8715. An act to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross;

H.R. 9877. An act to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove

certain restrictions on the American Hospital of Paris; and

H.R. 10323. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Irene McCafferty;

H.R. 2694. An act for the relief of John Allen;

H.R. 2926. An act for the relief of Efstahia Giannos;

H.R. 2933. An act for the relief of Kim Jai Sung;

H.R. 3062. An act for the relief of Son Chung Ja;

H.R. 3337. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonio de Oyarzabal;

H.R. 3765. An act for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis;

H.R. 3989. An act to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts;

H.R. 4596. An act for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling;

H.R. 5252. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 5768. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5839. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurtle, U.S. Marine Corps;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Cecil Graham;

H.R. 5903. An act for the relief of William C. Page;

H.R. 6294. An act to authorize Secret Service Agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss;

H.R. 8212. An act for the relief of Kent A. Herath;

H.R. 8352. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; and

H.R. 8469. An act to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 23, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1614. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1965, pur-

suant to section 605 of Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1615. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1616. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Essex River, Essex, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 16, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee of Conference. H.R. 8283. An act to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Rept. 1061). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TUCK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITENER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1781. A bill to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2627. A bill for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2653. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut shall also be held at New London, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7446. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Department of the Navy at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of California: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7723. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods; without amendment (Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8436. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8317. A bill to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 327. A bill to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems; with amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate concurrent resolution 49. Concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3689. A bill for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3875. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Panagioti Vastakis and Soteris Vastakis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4743. A bill for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid; with amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5231. A bill for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertla L. Wohlmuth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1240. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Engle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Albert Carter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7667. A bill for the relief of Donald F. Farrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Thomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5838. A bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10612. A bill for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Ore.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5973. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Hower; with amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10878. A bill for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3905. A bill for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8135. A bill for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5213. A bill for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay; with amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6720. A bill for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 11204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 11205. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 11206. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 11207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11208. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge and improve the research facility near Bruceton, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 11209. A bill to provide for the establishment of the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11210. A bill making appropriations for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11211. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11212. A bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11213. A bill to amend section 301(a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 11214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 11215. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11216. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 11217. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11218. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11219. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11220. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11221. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11222. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11223. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 670. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as Water Conservation Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

368. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 11225. A bill for the relief of Andreas (Andrew) Anastasiades, Mrs. Aglaia Anastasiades, Anna Anastasiades, Stellakis Anastasiades, and Mrs. Anna Stylianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11226. A bill for the relief of Hee Sook Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11227. A bill to authorize the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh, of New York, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Order of Isabella the

Catholic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11228. A bill for the relief of Vito Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11229. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co., and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11230. A bill for the relief of Juliana Kovak de Lazarevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

271. By Mr. SCHWEIKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Philadelphia requesting enactment of House Concurrent Resolution No. 465 relative to designating Philadelphia as the host city for the 1976 national bicentennial celebration commemorating two centuries of independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

272. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting enactment of House Concurrent Resolution No. 465 relative to designating Philadelphia as the host city for the 1976 national bicentennial celebration commemorating two centuries of independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, September 20, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we come to Thee at the beginning of our deliberations as from the Nation's beginning our fathers have turned aside to seek Thy face. Commissioned to be peacemakers for a war-torn world, we first need a peace within our own hearts far deeper than the world can give—for never does a new day find us fit for the highest service until we have cleansed and strengthened ourselves by communion with Thee.

We come with confession and contrition. There haunt us memories of duties unperformed, noble promptings disobeyed, deeds of kindness and pity that we have left too late, perhaps words untrue, acts unkind, thoughts impure. The stain of these is on us all. Make us brave enough to bear the truth even about ourselves and sincere enough to rise with our dead selves as stepping stones to higher things, with our climbing feet upon the path of the just and our faces bathed with the shining light that groweth more and more unto the perfect day.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 21, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10404. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force (retired).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 664. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 906. An act to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Pola Bodensteln;

S. 1190. An act to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1623. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other

pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1975. An act to amend the Northern Pacific Halibut Act in order to provide certain facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission; and

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10404. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; and

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Department of State.